

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXXV.—JULY, 1910—No. 139.

LITTERAE ENCYCLICAE.

VENERABILIBUS FRATRIBUS PATRIARCHIS PRIMATIBUS ARCHIEPISCOPIS EPISCOPIS ALIISQUE LOCORUM ORDINARIIS PACEM ET COMMUNIONEM CUM APOSTOLICA SEDE HABENTIBUS.

PIUS PP. X.

Venerabiles Fratres, Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.

EDITAE saepe Dei ore sententiae et sacris expressae litteris in hunc fere modum, iusti memoriam fore cum laudibus sempiternam eundemque loqui etiam defunctum (Ps. cxi., 7; Prov. x., 7; Heb. xi., 4), diuturna Ecclesiae opera et voce maxime comprobantur. Haec namque sanctitatis parens et altrix, iuvenili robore vigens ac Numinis afflatu semper acta "propter inhabitantem eius spiritum in nobis" (Rom. viii., 11), quemadmodum iustorum sobolem nobilissimam ipsa una gignit, enutrit, ulnisque complectitur suis, ita materni amoris instinctu de ipsorum retinenda memoria atque honore instaurando se praebet apprime sollicitam. Ex ea recordatione superna quadam suavitate perfunditur et a mortalis huius peregrinationis miseriis contuendis abducitur, quad beatos illos caelicolas *gaudium suum et coronam esse iam cernat*; quod in ipsis eminentem agnoscat Sponsi caelestis imaginem; quod novo testimonio suis filiis antiqua dicta confirmet: "diligentibus Deum omnia cooperantur in bonum, iis qui secundum propositum vocati sunt sancti." (Rom. viii., 28.) Horum autem praeclara facinora, non modo sunt ad commemorandum iucunda, sed etiam ad imitandum illustria, et

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1910, by P. J. Ryan, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

magnus virtutis excitator est concentus ille sanctorum Paullinae resonans voci: "imitatores mei estote sicut et ego Christi." (I. Cor. iv., 16.)

Ob haec, Venerabiles Fratres, Nos, qui vixdum suscepto pontificatu maximo, propositum significavimus enitendi constanter ut "omnia instaurarentur in Christo;" datis primum encyclicis litteris (Litt. Encycl. "E supremi," die IV. m. Octobr., MCMIII.) impense curavimus ut Nobiscum omnes intuerentur in "apostolum et pontificem confessionis nostrae, . . . in auctorem fidei et consummatorem Iesum." (Hebr. iii., 1; xii., 2-3.) At quoniam ea fere est infirmitas nostra, ut tanti exemplaris amplitudine facile deterreamur, providentis Dei numine, aliud a nobis est exemplar propositum, quod quum Christo sit proximum, quantum humanae licet naturae, tum aptius congruat cum exiguitate nostra, Beatissima Virgo Augusta Dei Mater. (Litt. Encycl. "Ad diem illum," die II. m. Februar., MCMIV.) Varias denique nancti occasiones recolendae memoriae sanctorum caelitum, communi admirationi obiecimus fideles hosce servos ac dispensatores in domo Domini, et prout suus cuique locus est, Eius amicos ac domesticos, qui "per fidem vicerunt regna operati sunt iustitiam, adepti sunt re promissiones" (Hebr. xi., 33), ut illorum exemplis adducti, "iam non simus parvuli fluctuantes et circumferamur omni vento doctrinae, in nequitia hominum, in astutia ad circumventionem erroris; veritatem autem facientes in charitate, crescamus in illo per omnia qui est caput Christus." (Eph. iv., 11 seq.)

Altissimum hoc divinae Providentiae consilium in tribus maxime viris perfectum fuisse docuimus, quos magnos pastores eosdemque doctores diversa quidem aetas tulit, sed aequa propemodum Ecclesiae calamitosa. Hi sunt Gregorius Magnus, Ioannes Chrysostomus et Augustanus Anselmus, quorum saecularia solemnia celebrari contigit per hos annos. Binis praeterea Encyclicis Litteris datis IV. Idus Martias anno MCMIV. et XI. Calend. Maias MCMIX., doctrinae capita et christianae vitae praecepta, quotquot opportuna cadere in haec tempora visa sunt, e sanctorum exemplis monitisque decepta, fusius evolvimus.

At quoniam persuasum Nobis est, ad impellendos homines, illustria Christi militum exempla longe magis valitura quam verba exquisitasque disceptationes (Encycl. "E Supremi"); oblata feliciter opportunitate libentes utimur saluberrima instituta ab alio pastore sanctissimo accepta commendandi, quem huic aetati propriorem iisdemque paene iactatum fluctibus Deus excitavit, Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae Cardinalem, Mediolanensium Antistitem, ante annos CCC. a sa. me. Paulo V. in sanctorum album relatum, Carolum Borromeum. Nec id minus ad rem; siquidem, ut memorati Decessoris Nostri verba

usurpemus: “Dominus, qui facit mirabilia magna solus, magnificavit novissime facere nobiscum, ac miro dispensationis suae opere statuit super Apostolicae petrae arcem grande luminare, eligens sibi e gremio sacrosanctae Romanae Ecclesiae Carolum, sacerdotem fidelem, servum bonum, formam gregis, formam Pastorum. Qui videlicet multiplici fulgore sanctorum operum universam decorando Ecclesiam, sacerdotibus et populo praeluceret quasi Abel in innocentia, quasi Enoch in munditia, quasi Iacob in laborum tolerantia, quasi Moyses in mansuetudine, quasi Elias in ardenti zelo, quique imitandum exhiberet inter affluentes delicias Hieronymi corporis castigationem, Martini in sublimioribus gradibus humilitatem, Gregorii pastoralem sollicitudinem, libertatem Ambrosii, Paulini caritatem, ac demum videndum ac perspiciendum ostenderet oculis nostris, manibus nostris contrectandum hominem, mundo maxime blandiente, crucifixum mundo, viventem spiritu, terrena calcantem, caelestia iugiter negotiantem et, sicut officio in angelum substitutum, ita etiam mente et opere vitam angelorum in terris aemulantem.”
(Ex Bulla “Unigenitus,” an. MDCX., Cal. Nov.)

Haec Decessor ille Noster exactis quinque lustris ab obitu Caroli. Nunc vero, expleto anno tercentesimo ab impertitis eidem sacris honoribus, “merito repletum est gaudio os nostrum et lingua nostra exsultatione in insigni die solemnitatis nostraræ, . . . in qua . . . Carolo S. R. E., cui, auctore Domino praesidemus, Presbytero Cardinali sacris decernendis honoribus, unicae Sponsæ suæ nova imponeretur corona, ornata omni lapide pretioso.” Communis autem cum Decessore Nostro fiducia Nobis est, ex contemplatione gloriae sancti Viri, multoque magis ex eiusdem documentis et exemplis, debilitari posse impiorum proterviam et confundi omnes qui “gloriantur in simulacris errorum.” (Ex eadem Bulla “Unigenitus.”) Itaque renovati Carolo honores, qui gregis ac pastorum huius aetatis exstitit forma, sacraeque disciplinae in melius corrigendæ impiger fuit propugnator et auctor adversus novos homines, quibus, non fidei morumque restitutio proposita erat, sed potius deformatio atque restrictio quum solacio ac documento erunt catholicis universis, tum iisdem stimulos addent, ut in opus, cui tam impense studemus, instauracionis rerum omnium in Christo, strenue conspirent.

Exploratum profecto vobis est, Venerabiles Fratres, perpetuo exagitatam Ecclesiam deserì a Deo numquam omni consolatione destitutam. Eam namque “Christus dilexit . . . et semetipsum tradidit pro ea, ut illam sanctificaret et exhiberet ipse sibi gloriosam Ecclesiam, non habentem maculam aut rugam, aut aliquid huiusmodi, sed ut sit sancta et immaculata.” (Eph. v., 25 sqq.) Quin etiam, quo effusior licentia, quo acrior hostilis impetus, quo erroris insidiae

callidiores afferre illi supremum videntur exitium, usque adeo, ut filios non paucos de gremio eius avulsos in vitiorum et impietatis gurgitem transversos agant, eo praesentiores experitur tutelam Numinis. Efficit enim Deus ut error ipse, velint nolint improbi, in triumphum cedat veritatis, cui custodiendae Ecclesia advigilat; corruptio in incrementum sanctitatis, cuius altrix ipsa est atque magistra; vexatio in mirabiliorem "salutem ex inimicis nostris." Ita fit ut, quo tempore Ecclesia profanis oculis videtur saevioribus iactata fluctibus ac paene demersa, tunc nempe pulchrior, validior, purior emergat, maximarum emicans fulgore virtutum.

Sic Dei summa benignitas novis argumentis confirmat, Ecclesiam opus esse divinum; sive quod in causa suscipiendi doloris maxima, ob irrepentes in ipsa eius membra errores et noxas, ei det superandum discrimen; sive quod ratum efficiat Christi verbum: "Portae inferi non praevalebunt adversus eam" (Matth. xvi., 18); sive quod eventibus illud comprobet: "ecce ego vobiscum sum omnibus diebus usque ad consummationem saeculi" (Matth. xxviii., 20); sive denique quod arcanae virtutis testimonium perhibeat, qua promissus a Christo, maturo huius in caelum reditu, "alius Paraclitus" in ipsam iugiter effunditur, ipsam tuetur et in omni tribulatione solatur; spiritus, "qui cum ipsa maneat in aeternum; spiritus veritatis, quem mundus non potest accipere, quia non videt eum nec scit eum, quia apud vos manebit et apud vos erit." (Ioan. xiv., 16 sqq.; xxvi., 59; xvi., 7 sqq.) Hoc ex fonte vita et robur Ecclesiae derivatur; hinc quod eadem, ut Concilium Oecumenicum Vaticanum habet, manifestis notis instructa et "tamquam signum levatum in nationes," a quavis alia societate secernitur. (Sessio iii., c. 3.)

Nec sane absque divinae potentiae prodigio fieri potest ut, diffluente licentia et passim deficientibus membris, Ecclesia, quatenus est corpus Christi mysticum, a doctrinae, legum finisque sui sanctitate nunquam desciscat; ex iisdem rerum causis pares consecutiones et utilitates derivet; ex complurium filiorum fide ac iustitia fructus capiat salutis uberrimos. Nec minus perspicuum haustae a Deo vitae habet indicium, quod in tam foeda pravarum opinionum colluvie, in tanto perduellium numero, in errorum facie adeo multiplici, constans et immutabilis perseveret, "columna et firmamentum veritatis," in unius professione doctrinae, in eadem communione sacramentorum, in divina sui constitutione, in regimine, in disciplina morum. Idque eo plus habet admirationis, quod ipsa, non solum resistit malo, sed etiam "vincit in bono malum," nec bene precari desinit amicis atque inimicis, de eo tota laborans idque assequi cupiens, ut et communitas hominum et seorsim singuli christianis institutis renoventur. Est enim hoc proprium eius munus in terris, cuius beneficia vel ipsi eius inimici sentiunt.

Mirabilis hic Dei providentis influxus in instaurationalis opus ab Ecclesia proiectum luculenter appetet ea maxime aetate, quae ad bonorum solacium dedit Carolum Borromeum. In eo dominatu cupiditatum, omni fere perturbata et offusa cognitione veritatis, perpetua erat cum erroribus dimicatio, hominumque societas in pessima quaeque ruens, gravem videbatur sibi conflare perniciem. Inter haec superbi ac rebelles homines consurgebant, “inimici Crucis Christi . . . qui terrena sapiunt . . . quorum Deus venter est.” (Philip. iii., 18-19.) Hi non moribus corrigendis, sed negandis Fidei capitibus animum intendentis, omnia miscebant, latiore sibi aliisque muniebant licentiae viam, aut certe auctoritatem Ecclesiae ductumque defugientes, pro lubitu corruptissimi cuiusque principis populi, quasi imposito iugo, doctrinam eius, constitutionem, disciplinam in excidium petebant. Deinde, iniquorum imitati morem, ad quos pertinet comminatio: “Vae qui dicitis malum bonum et bonum malum” (Isai. v., 20), rebellium tumultum et illam fidei morumque cladem appellarunt instaurationalem, sese autem disciplinae veteris restitutores. Re tamen vera corruptores extiterunt, quod, extenuatis Europae per contentiones et bella viribus, defectiones horum temporum et secessiones maturarunt, quibus uno velut impetu facto, triplex illud, antea disiunctum, dimicationalis instauratum est genus, a quo invicta et sospes Ecclesia semper evaserat; hoc est, primae aetatis cruenta certamina; domesticam subinde pestem errorum; denique, per speciem sacrae libertatis vindicandae, eam vitiorum luem ac disciplinae eversionem, ad quam fortasse nec aetas media processerat.

Decipientium hominum turbae Deus opposuit veri nominis instauratores, eosque sanctissimos, qui aut cursum illum praecipitem retardarent ardoremque restinguenter, aut illata inde damna sarcirent. Quorum labor assiduus et multiplex in restituenda disciplina eo maiori solacio Ecclesiae fuit, quo graviori haec premebatur angustia, comprobavitque sententiam: “Fidelis Deus, qui . . . facit etiam cum tentatione proventum.” (I. Cor. x., 13.) Iis in adjunctis laetitiam Ecclesiae cumulavit oblata divinitus Caroli Borromei singularis navitas vitaeque sanctitas.

Fuit autem in eius ministerio, Deo sic disponente, propria quaedam vis et efficientia, non solum ad infringendam audaciam factiosorum, sed etiam ad erudiendos Ecclesiae filios atque excitandos. Illorum namque et insanos cohibebat ausus, et inanes criminationes diluebat, eloquentia usus omnium potentissima, suae vitae et actionis exemplo; horum vero spem erigebat, alebat ardorem. Atque illud in ipso fuit plane mirabile, quod veri restauratoris dotes, quas in aliis disiunctas cernimus atque distinctas, ab juvenili aetate in se omnes recepit in unum collectas,

virtutem, consilium, doctrinam, auctoritatem, potentiam, alacritatem, effecitque ut in commissam sibi catholicae veritatis defensionem contra grassantes errores, quod idem erat Ecclesiae universae propositum, singulæ conspirarent, intermortuam in multis ac paene restinctam excitans fidem, providis eam legibus institutisque communiens, collapsam disciplinam restituens, cleri populique mores ad christianaæ vitae rationem strenue revocans. Sic, dum partes instauratoris tuetur omnes, haud minus mature "servi boni et fidelis" fungitur muniis, ac deinde sacerdotis magni, "qui in diebus suis placuit Deo et inventus est iustus;" plane dignus in quem cuiusvis generis homines tum e clero tum e populo, divites aequæ ac inopestatamquam in exemplar intueantur; cuius excellentiae summa in episcopi atque antistitis laude continetur, qua, Petri Apostoli dictis obtemperans, factus est "forma gregis ex animo." (I. Peter v., 3.) Nec minus movet admirationem quod Carolus, nondum exacto anno aetatis suae vicesimo, summos honores consecutus, magnis ac perarduis Ecclesiae negotiis tractandis adhibitus, ad perfectam cumulatamque virtutem, per contemplationem rerum divinarum, qua in sacro secessu animum renovaverat, in dies magis contenderet, eluceretque "spectaculum . . . mundo et angelis et hominibus."

Tum vere Dominus coepit, ut memorati Decessoris Pauli V. verbis utamur, "mirabilia sua" in Carolo pandere; sapientiam, iustitiam, divini honoris et catholici provehendi nominis studium flagrantissimum, in primisque curam instaurandæ Fidei Ecclesiaeque universæ, quod opus in augusto illo Tridentino Consilio agitabatur. Cuius habitu laus ab eodem pontifice ab omnique posteritate sic tribuitur Carolo, quasi viro, qui, non ante illius exsequitor exstiterit fidelissimus, quam propugnator acerrimus. Nec enim sine multis eius vigiliis, angustiis, laboribus omne genus, res est ad exitum perducta.

Haec tamen omnia nihil erant aliud nisi præparatio quaedam vitaeque tirocinium, quo et pietate animus et mens doctrina et labore corpus exercerentur, ita ut modestus iuvenis ac de se demisse sentiens instar esset argillæ in manibus Domini eiusque in terris Vicarii. Hanc scilicet rationem ineundæ viae novarum rerum fautores illi contemnebant eadem stultitia qua nostri, minime secum reputantes, mirabilia Dei ex umbra et silentio parentis animi pieque precantis in apricum proferri, in eâque exercitatione germen futuri adscensus, haud secus ac in semente spem colligendæ messis, includi.

Nihilominus, quod paullo superius attigimus, auspicata tam faustis initiiis vitae sanctitas et actio tum se maxime explicit effuditque fructus uberrimos, quum, "urbano splendore et amplitudine relictis, bonus operarius in messem quam suscepérat (Mediolanum), discedit, ubi partes suas in dies magis implendo, agrum illum, malitia tem-

porum, vepribus turpiter deformem ac silvescentem, in eum restituit nitorem, ut Ecclesiam Mediolanensem, paeclarum exemplum redderet ecclesiasticae disciplinae.” (Bulla “Unigenitus.”) Tam multa tamque paeclara is est consequutus conformando instauracionis opus ad normas a Concilio Tridentino paullo ante propositas.

Enivero Ecclesia, probe intelligens, quam sint “sensus et cogitatio humani cordis in malum prona” (Gen. viii., 21), cum vitiis et erroribus dimicare nunquam destitit, “ut destruatur corpus peccati et ultra non serviamus peccato.” (Rom. vi., 6.) Qua in contentione, quemadmodum ipsa sibi magistra est et impellitur gratia, quae “diffusa est in cordibus nostris per Spiritum Sanctum;” ita cogitandi agendique normam sumit a Doctore gentium, aiente: “Renovavimini spiritu mentis vestrae.” (Ephes. iv., 23.) “Et nolite conformari huic saeculo sed reformamini in novitate sensus vestri, ut probetis quae sit voluntas Dei bona et beneplacens et perfecta.” (Rom. xii., 2.) Quam quidem se metam contigisse Ecclesiae filius atque instaurator non fictus existimat nunquam; ad eam tantummodo niti profitetur cum eodem apostolo; “quae retro sunt obliviscens, ad ea vero quae sunt priora extendens meipsum, ad destinatum persequor, ad bravium supernae vocationis Dei in Christo Iesu.” (Philip. iii., 13, 14.)

Inde consequitur ut et nos cum Christo in Ecclesia coniuncti “crescamus in illo per omnia, qui est caput Christus, ex quo totum corpus . . . augmentum facit in aedificationem sui in charitate” (Ephes. iv., 15, 16), et Ecclesia Mater in dies magis efficiat ratum sacramentum divinae voluntatis, hoc est, “in dispensatione plenitudinis temporum instaurare omnia in Christo.” (Ephes. i., 9, 10.)

Ad haec animum non intenderunt auctores illi redintegranda suo marte fidei ac disciplinae, quorum conatibus restitit Borromeus; nec ea nostri melius vident, quibuscum strenue nobis, Venerabiles Frates, est dimicandum. Nam et hi Ecclesiae doctrinam, leges, instituta subvertunt, habentes in lingua promptum cultioris humanitatis studium, non quod eo de negotio valde laborent, sed quo titulis ad ostentationem paratis pravitatem consiliorum queant facilius obtegere.

Quid autem re agant, quid moliantur, quod iter affectent, neminem vestrum fugit, eorumque consilia denuntiata per Nos fuerunt atque damnata. Proposita namque ipsis est communis omnium ab Ecclesiae fide ac disciplina secessio, eo vetere illa deterior quae Caroli aetatem in discrimen adduxit, quo callidius in ipsis fere Ecclesiae venis delitescit ac serpit, et quo subtilius ab absurde positis extrema deducuntur.

Utriusque pestis origo eadem; “inimicus homo,” qui ad humanae gentis perniciem haud sane exsomnis, “superseminavit zizaniam in

medio tritici" (Matth. xiii., 25); idem abditum iter ac tenebricosum; eadem progressio; idem appulsus. Etenim, quemadmodum prior illa olim, qua fortuna rem daret eo vires inclinans, optimatum partes aut popularium alteram adversus alteram concitabat, ut utramque tandem ludificaret atque pessum daret; sic recentior ista clades mutuam exacuit invidiam egentium ac locupletium, ut sua quisque sorte non contentus vitam trahat usque miserrimam luatque poenam iis irrogatam, qui non "regnum Dei et iustitiam eius" quaerunt, sed caducis his rebus fluxisque adhaerescunt. Atque illud etiam graviorem facit praesentem conflictationem, quod, quum superiorum temporum turbulenti homines e doctrinae divinitus revelatae thesauro certa quaedam et fixa plerumque retinerent, hodierni non ante queturi videantur quam excisa omnia conspexerint. Everso autem religionis fundamento, et ipsam civilem coniunctionem disrupti necesse est. Luctuosum sane spectaculum in praesens, formidolosum in posterum; non quod Ecclesiae incolumenti timendum sit, de qua dubitare divina promissa non sinunt, sed ob impendentia familiis gentibusque pericula, maxime quae pestiferum impietatis afflatum aut impensius fovent aut ferunt patientius.

In hoc tam nefario stultoque bello, cui commovendo dilatando socii et adiutores potentes accedunt interdum vel ipsi, qui Nobiscum facere Nostrasque tueri res deberent prae ceteris; in forma errorum adeo multiplici vitiorumque illecebris tam variis, quibus utrisque haud pauci etiam e nostris blandiuntur, capti specie novitatis ac doctrinae, aut inani spe ducti. Ecclesiam posse cum aevi placitis amice componi, plane intelligitis, Venerabiles Fratres, nobis esse strenue obsistendum, iisdemque nunc armis excipiendum impetum hostium, quibus olim usus est Borromeus.

Primum igitur, quoniam ipsam, veluti arcem, impetunt fidem, vel eam aperte denegando, vel impugnando subdole, vel doctrinae capita pervertendo, haec a Carolo saepe commendata meminerimus: "Prima et maxima Pastorum cura versari debet in iis quae ad fidem catholicam, quam S. Romana Ecclesia et colit et docet, et sine qua *impossibile est placere Deo*, integre inviolateque servandam pertinent." (Conc. Prov. i., sub initium.) Et rursus: "In eo genere . . . nullum tantum studium, quantum certe maximum requiritur, adhiberi possit." (Conc. Prov. v., Pars. i.) Quapropter "haereticæ pravitatis fermento," quod nisi cohibeatur "totam massam corruptit," hoc est pravis opinionibus ementita specie irrepentibus, quae in unum collectas *modernismus* profitetur, sanitas est opponenda doctrinae et reputandum cum Carolo: "quam sumnum in haeresis crimine profligando studium et cura quam longe omnium diligentissima episcopi esse beatum." (Conc. Prov. v., Pars. i.)

Haud opus est equidem cetera verba referre sancti viri com-

memorantis Romanorum Pontificum sanctiones, leges, poenas in eos antistites constitutas, quibus purgandae dioecesis ab “haereticae pravitatis fermento” esset cura remissior. Non nihil tamen iuverit ad ea quae inde concludit diligenter attendere. “Proinde, inquit, in ea perenni sollicitudine perpetuaque vigilia episcopus versari in primis debet, ut, non modo pestilentissimus ille haeresis morbus nusquam in gregem sibi commissum irrepat, sed omnis plane suspicio ab eo quam longissime absit. Si vero fortasse, quod pro sua pietate et misericordia Christus Dominus avertat, irrepserset, in eo maxime elaboret omni ope, ut quam celerrime depellatur: quique ea labore infecti erunt, vel suspecti, cum illis agatur ad canonum sanctionumque pontificiarum praescriptum.” (Conc. Prov. v., Pars. i.)

Verum nec propulsari possunt errorum contagia nec praecaveri, nisi in recta cleri populiique institutione pars curaum ponatur maxima. Nam “fides ex auditu; auditus autem per verbum Christi.” (Rom. x., 17.) Veri autem omnium auribus inculcandi necessitas nunc magis imponitur, quum per omnes reipublicae venas, atque etiam qua minime crederes, serpere cernimus malum virus; adeo ut ad omnes hodie pertineant adductae a Carolo causae hisce verbis: “Haereticis finitimi nisi in fidei fundamentis firmi fuerint ac stabiles, summopere verendum esset, ne forte ab eis in aliquam impietatis ac nefariae doctrinae fraudem facilius adducerentur.” (Conc. Prov. v., Pars. i.) Nunc enim, expeditioribus itineribus, quemadmodum ceterarum rerum, ita etiam errorum sunt aucta commercia, proiectisque ad licentiam cupiditatibus, in prava societate versamur, ubi “non est veritas . . . et non est scientia Dei (Os. iv., 1); in terra quae desolata est . . . quia nullus est qui recognitet corde.” (Ierem. xii., 11.) Quamobrem Nos, ut Caroli verba usurpemus: “multam hactenus diligentiam adhibuimus, ut omnes ac singuli Christi fideles in fidei christianaे rudimentorum institutione erudirentur (Conc. Prov. v., Pars. i.); eademque de re, tamquam de negotio gravissimo scripsimus Encyclicas Litteras. (Encycl. “Acerbo nimis,” die XXV. m. Aprilis MDCCCCV.) Etsi vero nolumus et illa Nobis aptare, quibus inexplebili desiderio flagrans Borromeus queritur, “parum hoc usque profecisse tanta in re;” nihilominus eadem, qua ipse, “negotii periculique magnitudine adducti,” addere stimulus velimus omnibus, ut, Caroli similitudinem arripientes, pro suo quisque munere aut viribus, in christianaे restaurationis opus conspirent. Quare meminerint patres familias ac domini, quo studio pastor ille sanctissimus eosdem constanter monuerit ut liberis, domesticis, famulis addiscendae christianaे doctrinae, non solum copiam facerent, sed etiam onus imponerent. Clericis pariter memoria ne excidat, in fidei rudimentis tradendis a se operam dandam

esse curioni; huic vero studendum, ut eiusmodi scholae suppetant plures, christifidelium numero ac necessitati pares et magistrorum probitate commendabiles, quibus adiutores adsciscantur honesti viri aut mulieres, prout Mediolanensis ipse praescribit antistes. (Conc. Prov. v., Paris. i.)

Christianae huius institutionis aucta necessitas, quum ex reliquo nostrorum temporum morumque decursu eminet, tum vero potissimum ex publicis discendi ludis, omnis religionis expertibus, ubi sanctissima quaeque rideri voluptatis loco fere ducitur, aequa pronis ad impietatem et magistrorum labiis et auribus auditorum. Scholam dicimus, quam *neutram*, seu *laicam* per summan iniuriam appellant, quum non sit aliud nisi tenebricosae sectae dominatus praepotens. Novum hoc praeposterae libertatis iugum magna quidem voce et bonis lateribus denuntiastis vos, Venerabiles Fratres, praesertim in locis ubi audacius proculata sunt iura religionis ac familiae et oppressa naturae vox imperantis ut adolescentium candori fideique parcatur. Cui calamitati ab iis illatae, qui, quam ab aliis oboedientiam exigunt, eandem supremo rerum Domino recusant, quantum in Nobis est medendum rati, auctores fuimus ut scholae religionis opportune per urbes instituerentur. Quod opus quamquam hactenus, adnitentibus vobis, satis bene prospereque processit, nihilominus magnopere expetendum est ut in dies latius proferatur, hoc est ut eiusmodi magisteria et pateant ubique complura et praceptoribus abundant doctrinae laude vitaeque integritate commendatis.

Cum hac primordiorum saluberrima disciplina valde coniunctum est officium sacri oratoris, in quo memoratae virtutes multo magis requiruntur. Itaque Caroli studia et consilia provincialibus in Synodis ac dioecesanis eo potissimum fuere conversa ut concionatores fingerentur, qui "in ministerio verbi" versari sancte atque utiliter possent. Quod idem, ac forte gravius, quae modo sunt tempora postulare a nobis videntur quum tot hominum nutet fides, nec desint qui, captandae gloriolae cupidine, ingenio aetatis indulgeant, "adulterantes verbum Dei," vitaeque cibum subducentes fidelibus.

Quamobrem summa vigilancia cavendum nobis est, Venerabiles Fratres, ne per vanos homines ac leves vento pascatur grex; sed ut vitali alimento roboretur per "ministros verbi," ad quos illa pertinent: "Pro Christo legatione fungimur, tamquam Deo exhortante per nos: reconciliamini Deo (II. Cor. v., 20); per ministros et legatos non ambulantes in astutia, neque adulterantes verbum Dei, sed in manifestatione veritatis, commendantes semetipsos ad omnem conscientiam hominum coram Deo (II. Cor. iv., 2), operarios inconfusibilis tractantes verbum veritatis." (II. Tim. ii., 15.) Nec minus usui nobis erunt normae illae sanctissimae maximeque frugiferae, quas

mediolanensis antistes, Paullinis verbis expressas, commendare solebat fidelibus: “Cum accepissetis a nobis verbum auditum Dei, accepistis illud, non ut verbum hominum, sed, sicut est vere, verbum Dei, qui operatur in vobis, qui credidistis.” (I. Thess. ii., 13.)

Ita “sermo Dei vivus et efficax et penetrabilior omni gladio” (Hebr. iv., 12), non solum ad fidei conservationem ac tutelam adducet, sed eiam ad virtutum proposita mire animos inflammabit; quia “fides sine operibus mortua est” (Iacob. ii., 26), et “non auditores legis iusti sunt apud Deum, sed factores legis iustificabuntur.” (Rom. ii., 13.)

Atque hac etiam in re cernere licet, utriusque instauratio quam sit ratio dissimilis. Nam qui falsam propugnant, ii stultorum imitati inconstantiam, praecipi cursu solent ad exstrema decurrere, sive fidem sic efferentes, ut ab ea recte agendi necessitatem seiungant, sive in sola natura excellentiam omnem virtutis collocantes, remotis fidei ac divinae gratiae praesidiis. Quo fit ut, quae a naturali honestate ducuntur officia nihil sint aliud nisi simulacra virtutis, nec diuturna illa quidem, nec ad salutem satis idonea. Horum igitur actio, non ad restorationem disciplinae, sed ad fidei morumque eversionem est comparata.

Contra qui ad Carolie exemplum, veritatis amici minimeque fallaces, salutari rerum conversioni student, hi extrema devitant, neque certos excedunt fines, quos ultra nequit instauratio ulla consistere. Etenim Ecclesiae eiusque Capiti Christo firmissime adhaerentes, non modo inde robur vitae interioris hauriunt, sed exterioris etiam actionis metiuntur modum, ut sananda hominum societatis opus tuto aggrediantur. Est autem proprium divinae huius missionis, in eos perpetuo transmissae qui Christi legatione functuri essent, “docere omnes gentes,” non solum ea quae ad credendum, sed etiam quae ad agendum pertinerent, hoc est, uti Christus edixit: “servare omnia quaecumque mandavi vobis.” (Matth. xxviii., 18, 20.) Ipse enim est “via, veritas et vita” (Ioan. xiv., 6), qui venit ut homines “vitam habeant et abundantius habeant.” (Ioan. x., 10.) Quia vero officia illa retineri omnia duce tantum natura est difficillimum, quin etiam multo positum superius quam ut humanae vires ipsae per se consequi possint; idcirco Ecclesia magisterio suo adiunctum habet christiana regimen societatis eiusque ad omnem sanctitatem instituendae munus, dum per eos qui pro suo quisque statu et officio sese illi ministros adiutoresve praebent, apta et necessaria salutis instrumenta suppeditat. Quod plane intelligentes verae instauratio auctores, non ii surculos, praeservandae radicis gratia, coercent, hoc est, non fidem a vitae sanctitate seiungunt, sed utramque alunt foventque halitu caritatis, quae “est vinculum perfectionis.” (Colos. iii., 14.) Idem. dicto audientes Apostolo,

“depositum custodiunt” (I. Tim. vi., 20), non ut gentibus notitiam eius occulant lumenque subducant, sed quo deductos ex eo fonte veritatis ac vitae saluberrimos rivos latius recludant. In eaque copia doctrinam ad usum adiungunt, illa utentes ad praeripiendam “circumventionem erroris,” hoc ad paecepta in mores actionemque vitae deducenda. Quamobrem instrumenta omnia ad finem vel apta vel necessaria comparant, quum ad extirpationem peccati, tum “ad consummationem sanctorum, in opus ministerii, in aedificationem corporis Christi.” (Eph. iv., 12.) Huc sane spectant Patron et Conciliorum statuta canones leges; huc adiumenta illa doctrinae, regiminis, beneficentiae omne genus; huc denique disciplina et actio Ecclesiae universa. Hos fidei virtutisque magistros intentis oculis animoque intuetur verus Ecclesiae filius, cuius sua ipsius emendatio proposita est atque aliorum. His auctoribus, quos crebro memorat, in instauranda Ecclesiae disciplina nititur Borromeus; ut quum scribit: “Nos veterem sanctorum Patrum sacrorumque Conciliorum consuetudinem et auctoritatem, in primis oecumenicae Synodi Tridentinae secuti, de iis ipsis multa superioribus nostris Conciliis Provincialibus costituimus.” Idem ad consilia publicae corruptelae coercendae adductum se profitetur “et secrorum canonum iure et sacrosanctis sanctionibus, et Concilii in primis Tridentini decretis.” (Conc. Prov. v., Pars. i.)

His non contentus, quo sibi melius caveret ne forte ab ea norma unquam discederet, a se statuta in Synodis provincialibus ita fere concludit: “Omnia et singula quae a nobis in hac provinciali Synodo decreta actaque sunt, qua debemus oboedientia et reverentia, auctoritati ac iudicio Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae, omnium ecclesiarum matris et magistrae, semper emendanda et corrigenda subicimus.” (Conc. Prov. vi., sub finem.) Quam quidem voluntatem ostendit eo propensiorem, quo in dies magis ad actuosae vitae perfectionem grassabatur; nec solum quamdiu cathedram Petri occupavit patruus, sed etiam sedentibus, qui ei successerunt, Pio V. et Gregorio XIII., quibus quemadmodum strenue suffragatus est ad pontificatum, sic in rebus maximis validum se socium adiunxit eorumque exspectationi cumulate respondit.

Potissimum vero ipsorum voluntati est obsequutus instruendis rebus ad propositum sibi finem idoneis, hoc est ad sacrae disciplinae instaurationem. Qua in re prorsus absuit ab illorum ingenio, qui speciem studii fervidoris imponunt contumaciae suae. Itaque, incipiens “iudicium a domo Dei” (I. Peter iv., 17), primum omnium cleri disciplinae ad certas leges conformandae animum adiecit; cuius rei causa sacri ordinis alumnorum Seminaria excitavit, sacerdotum congregations, queis nomen *oblatis*, instituit, religiosas familias tum veteres tum recentiores adscivit, concilia coegit, quaesitis undique

praesidiis coeptum opus munivit auxilium. Mox emendandis populi moribus haud remissorem admovit manum, sibi dictum reputans quod olim prophetae: “Ecce constitui te hodie . . . ut evelus et destruas, ut disperdas et dissipes, et aedifices et plantes.” (Ier i., 10.) Quare bonus pastor ecclesias provinciae ipse per se nec sine magno labore lustrans, arrepta similitudine divini Magistri, “pertransiit benefaciendo et sanando” gregis vulnera; quae passim deprehenderet incommoda, sive ex inscitia sive ex neglectu legum profecta, tollere atque eradere summa ope contendit; opinionum pravitati et exundanti coeno libidinum quasi aggerem obiecit a se apertos puerilis institutionis ludos et epheborum convictus; auctas, quas in Urbe primum excitatas noverat, consociationes Mariales; reclusa orbitati adolescentium hospitia; mulierculis periclitantibus, viduis, aliisque, tum viris tum feminis, egenis aut morbo seniove confectis, patefacta perfugia; pauperum tutelam ab impotentia dominorum, ab iniquo foenore, ab exportatione puerorum, aliaque id genus quamplurima. Haec autem sic praestitit, ut ab eorum consuetudine toto caelo abhorret, qui, in renovanda suo marte christiana republica, omnia carent agitantque vanissimo strepitu, divinae vocis immemores: “non in commotione Dominus.” (III. Reg. xix., 11.)

Hac nempe altera nota, prout vos experiendo didicistis, Venerabiles Fratres, veri nominis instauratores distinguuntur a fictis, quod illi “quae sua sunt quaerunt, non quae Iesu Christi” (Philip. ii., 21), pronisque auribus excipientes insidiosa dicta ad Magistrum divinum olim conversa: “manifesta te ipsum mundo” (Ioan. vii., 4), superbas iterant voces: “Faciamus et ipsi nobis nomen.” Cuius temeritatis causa, quod etiamnunc fieri saepe dolemus, “ceciderunt sacerdotes in bello, dum volunt fortiter facere, dum sine consilio exeunt in proelium.” (I. Machab. v., 57, 67.)

Contra qui societati hominum ad meliora deducenda sincero animo studet, is “non propriam gloriam quaerit, sed gloriam eius qui misit eum” (Ioan. vii., 18); seque ad Christi exemplum conformans, “non contendent neque clamabit, neque audiet aliquis in plateis vocem eius; non erit tristis neque turbulentus” (Isai. xlii., 2 sq.; Matth. xii., 19), sed “mitis et humilis corde.” (Matth. xi., 29.) Hic et probatus Deo erit et salutis fructus consequetur amplissimos.

In eo quoque secernuntur alter ab altero, quod ille, humanis tantum innixus viribus “confidit in homine et ponit carnem brachium suum” (Ier. xvii., 5); hic vero fiduciam omnem in Deo collocat; ab Ipso et a supernis opibus vim omnem et robur exspectat, iterans Apostoli verba: “Omnia possum in eo quie me confortat.” (Philip. iv., 13.)

Has opes, quarum uberem copiam Christus effudit, vir fidelis in media quaerit Ecclesia ad communem salutem, in primisque precandi studium, sacrificium, sacramenta, quae fiunt “quasi fons aquae

salientis in vitam aeternam." (Ioan. iv., 14.) Ea omnia inique ferentes qui, transversis itineribus et posthabito Deo, ad instauracionis opus contendunt, nunquam desinunt haustus illos purissimos, sin funditus exsiccare, at certe turbulentos facere, ut christianus grex inde arceatur. Qua in re profecto turpius agunt recentiores ipsorum asseclae, qui speciem quandam religionis nobilioris adhibentes, adminicula illa salutis pro minimo ducunt habentque ludibrio, praesertim sacramenta duo, quibus aut admissa paenitentium expiantur, aut caelesti dape roboratur animus. Quapropter optimus quisque summo studio curabit, ut collata tanti pretii dona maximo in honore habeantur, neve patietur in utrumque divinae caritatis opus hominum studia restinguiri.

Ita plane se gessit Borromeus, cuius inter cetera hoc scriptum legimus: "Quo maior et uberior est sacramentorum fructus quam ut eius vis explicari facile possit, eo diligentius et intima animi pietate et externo cultu ac veneratione tractanda ac precipienda sunt." (Conc. Prov. i., Pars. ii.) Illa quoque memoratu dignissima, quibus curiones aliosque sacros concionatores vehementer hortatur, ut caelestis alimenti crebram gustationem in pristinam consuetudinem revocarent; quod idem Nos egimus decreto, cui initium: *Sacra Tridentina Synodus.* "Ad saluberrimum illum, ait sanctus Antistes, sacrae Eucharistiae frequenter sumendae usum, parochi . . . et concionatores item quam saepissime populum cohortentur, nascentis Ecclesiae institutis atque exemplis, et gravissimorum Patrum vocibus et uberrima hoc ipso de genere Catechismi romani doctrina, et sententia denique Tridentinae Synodi, quae optaret quidem fideles, in singulis Missis, non solum spirituali affectu, sed sacramentali etiam Eucharistiae perceptione communicare." (Conc. Prov. iii., Pars. i.) Qua vero mente, quo animo adeundum sit sacrum convivium, docet his verbis: "Populus, cum ad frequentem SSmi Sacramenti sumendi usum excitetur, tum etiam commonefiat, quam periculosum exitiosumque sit ad sacram divini illius cibi mensam indigne accedere." (Conc. Prov. iv., Pars. ii.) Quam quidem diligentiam postulare videntur maxime haec tempora nutantis fidei et languescentis caritatis, ne forte ex frequentiore usu debita tanto mysterio reverentia minuatur, sed ptotius in hoc ipso sit causa cur "probet seipsum homo, et sic de pane illo edat et de calice bibat." (Cor. xi., 28.)

Ex iis fontibus dives gratiae vena manabit, unde succum trahant et alantur humanae quoque ac naturales industriae. Nec enim actio christiani viri quae usui sunt et adiumento vitae despiciet, ab uno eodemque Deo, auctore gratiae ac naturae profecta; sed illud valde cavebit, ne in externis rebus bonisque corporis captandis fruendis totius vitae finis et quasi beatitas collocetur. His rebus igitur qui

recte ac temperanter uti velit, eas conferet ad animorum utilitatem, Christi obtemperans dicto: "Quaerite primum regnum Dei et iustitiam eius, et haec omnia adicientur vobis." (Luc. xii., 31; Matth. vi., 33.)

Ordinatus et sapiens hic rerum usus tantum abest ut inferioris ordinis, id est societatis civilis bono aduersetur, ut potius huius commoda maxime provehat; nec id inani verborum iactatione, qui mos est factiosorum hominum, sed re ipsa et summa contentione, usque ad bonorum, virium, vitaeque iacturam. Cuius exempla fortitudinis prae ceteris exhibent sacrorum antistites complures, qui, rebus Ecclesiae afflictis, Caroli ardorem aemulati, divini Magistri ratas efficiunt voces: "Bonus pastor animam suam dat pro ovibus suis." (Ioan., x., 11.) Hi quidem, non gloriae cupidine, aut studio partium, aut privati alicuius commodi causa, ad se devovendos pro communi salute trahuntur, sed caritate illa quae *nunquam excidit*. Hac flamma, quae profanos oculos latet, incensus Borromeus, quum ob praestitam lue correptis operam se in mortis discrimen conieisset, nihilominus praesentibus occurrisse malis non contentus, de futuris etiam sollicitum se sic ostendit: "Omni rationi plane consentaneum est, ut, quemadmodum parens optimus, qui filios unice diligit, cum in praesenti tum in futuro eis prospicit ac parat quae sunt ad vitae cultum necessaria; ita nos paternae charitatis officio adducti, omni praecautione fidelibus provinciae nostrae in hoc Concilio provinciali quinto consulamus provideamusque deinceps quae experiendo cognovimus, pestilentiae tempore, salutaria esse adiumenta." (Conc. Prov. v., Pars. ii.)

Eadem haec providentis animi studia et consilia, Venerabiles Fratres, per eam quam saepe commendavimus, catholicam actionem, in rem usumque deducuntur. In partem vero ministerii huius amplissimi, quod officia omnia misericordiae, sempiterno donanda regno complectitur (Matth. xxv., 34 sq.), selecti etiam e populo advocantur viri. Qui, ubi semel id oneris in se receperint, parati et instructi esse debent ad se suaque omnia plane devovenda pro optima causa, ad obsistendum invidiae, obtrectationi et infenso quoque multorum animo, qui malefactis beneficia repensant, ad laborandum "sicut bonus miles Christi" (II. Tim. ii., 3), et currendum "per patientiam ad propositum nobis certamen, aspicientes in auctorem fidei et consummatorem Iesum." (Hebr. xii., 1, 2.) Acerbum sane luctae genus, sed ad bonum civitatis apprime conducens, etiamsi plenam victoriam remoretur dies.

In his etiam, quae modo dicta sunt, illustria Caroli exempla intueri licet, atque inde sumere quae pro sua quisque conditione imitetur et quibus animum erigat. Etenim quem et singularis virtus et mira solertia et effusa caritas adeo spectabilem effecerunt, nec

ipse tamen alienam sibi sensit hanc legem: "Omnes, qui pie volunt vivere in Christo Iesu, persecutionem patientur." (II. Tim. iii., 12.) Itaque quod asperioris vitae sectaretur genus, quod recta semper et honesta retineret, quod incorruptus legum iustitiaeque vindex exsisteret, hoc ipso primorum in se invidiam collegit; reipublicae gerendae peritorum vafris artibus est obiectus; magistratus habuit infensos; in optimatum, cleri populique suspicionem venit; flagitosorum denique hominum capitale odium sibi conflavit, ad necem usque petitus. Quibus omnibus, quamvis miti esset suavique indole, invicto animo restitut.

Nec modo nihil cessit in iis quae fidei ac moribus exitio forent, sed ne postulationes quidem exceptit adversas disciplinae aut fideli populo graves, etiamsi allatas, ut creditur, a rege potentissimo et ceteroquin catholico. Idemque memor verbi Christi: "Reddite quae sunt Cæsaris Cæsari et quae sunt Dei Deo" (Matth. xxii., 21), atque apostolorum vocis: "obedire oportet Deo magis quam hominibus" (Acts v., 29), non de causa tantum religionis optime meruit, verum etiam de ipsa societate civili, quam insanientis prudentiae poenas luentem, commotisque suapte manu seditionum fiuctibus paene submersam abduxit certissimae morti.

Eadem sane laus et gratia debebitur catholicis huius temporis viris eorumque strenuis ducibus episcopis, quibus in utrisque nullae officiorum partes, quae civium sunt, desiderari poterunt unquam, sive agatur de servanda fide ac reverentia "dominis etiam dyscolis" iusta praecipientibus, sive de ipsorum iniquis imperiis detrectandis, aequa remota tum procaci licentia delabentium in seditiones ac turbas, tum servili abiectione excipientium quasi sacras leges impia statuta pessimorum hominum, qui mentito libertatis nomine iura omnia pervertentes, durissimam imponunt servitutem.

Haec nempe in conspectu terrarum orbis et in media luce praesentis humanitatis sibi sedem constituisse videtur "potestas tenebrarum." Quo praepotenti sub dominatu iura omnia filiorum Ecclesiae miserrime proculcantur, extincto penitus in reipublicae rectoribus omni sensu magnanimitatis, urbanitatis ac fidei, quibus virtutibus eorum patres, christiano titulo insignes, tamdiu inclaruerunt. Adeo liquet, concepto semel in Deum et in Ecclesiam odio, retro sublapsa referri omnia, et ad antiquae libertatis ferociam, seu verius ad crudelissimum iugum, per unam Christi Familiam eiusque invectam disciplinam depulsum cervicibus, fieri cursum praecipitem. Aut, quod idem significavit Carolus, adeo est "certum atque exploratum, nulla alia re Deum gravius offendit, nullaque ad vehementiorem iram quam haeresum labore provocari; nihilque rursus ad provinciarum regnorumque interitum maiores vires habere, quam teterimam illam pestem." (Conc. Prov. v., Pars. i.) Quamquam

multo etiam funestior existimanda est hodierna conspiratio ad christianas gentes ab Ecclesiae sinu avellendas. In summa enim dissensione sententiarum ac voluntatum, quae propria nota est aberrantium a vero, in una re inimici consentiunt, hoc est in pertinaci iustitiae ac veritatis oppugnatione; cuius utriusque quia custos est ac vindicta Ecclesia, in hanc unam confertis ordinibus impetum faciunt. Cumque se neutris in partibus esse, aut etiam causam pacis fovere dictent, mellitis quidem verbis, at non dissimilatis consiliis, nihil aliud revera agunt, nisi ut insidias locent, addentes damno ludibrium, fraudem violentiae. Novo igitur certaminis genere per hos dies christianum impetratur nomen; belli moles conflatur longe periculosior ac pugnae antea pugnatae, ex quibus tam amplam collegit gloriam Borromeus.

Inde exempla nobis omnibus ac documenta sumentes, pro rebus maximis, quibus et privata et publica salus continetur, pro fide ac religione, pro sanctitate publici iuris, alacri erectoque animo dimicabimus, dolenda quidem necessitate compulsi, sed suavi simul freti fiducia, omnipotentem Deum tam gloria in acie militantibus victoriam deproferatur. Cui fiduciae robur addit Caroliani operis producta adhanc usque aetatem vis et potentia, sive ad obfirmandum animum in proposito sancto instaurandi omnia in Christo.

Licet nunc, Venerabiles Fratres, iisdem verbis dicendo finem imponere, quibus pluries memoratus Decessor Noster Paulus V. Litteras absolvit decernentes Carolo supremos honores: “Aequum est igitur dare nos gloriam et honorem et benedictionem viventi in saecula saeculorum, qui benedixit conservum nostrum in omni benedictione spirituali, ut esset sanctus et immaculatus coram ipso, et cum illum dederit nobis Dominus tamquam fulgentem stellam in hac nocte peccatorum, tribulationum nostrarum, audeamus, ad divinam clementiam ore et opere supplicantes, ut Carolus Ecclesiae quam vehementer dilexit, prospicit etiam meritis et exemplo, adsit patrocinio et in tempore iracundiae fiat reconciliatio, per Christum Dominum nostrum.” (Bulla “Unigenitus.”)

Accedat his votis cumuletque communem spem Apostolicae benedictionis auspicium, quam vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, et vestro cuiusque clero populoque peramanter impetrimus.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum, die XXVI. mensis Maii, anno MDCCCCX., Pontificatus Nostri septimo.

PIUS PP. X.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF OUR MOST HOLY LORD
PIUS X.

BY DIVINE PROVIDENCE POPE.

ON THE TER-CENTENARY OF THE CANONIZATION OF
ST. CHARLES BORROMEO.TO THE PATRIARCHS, PRIMATES, ARCHBISHOPS, BISHOPS AND OTHER
ORDINARIES IN PEACE AND COMMUNION WITH THE APOSTOLIC
SEE.

PIUS X. POPE.

Venerable Brothers, Health and the Apostolic Benediction.

WHAT the Divine word time and again records in the Sacred Scriptures—that the just man shall live in eternal memory of praise, and that he speaks even when dead (Ps. cxi., 7; Prov. x., 7; Hebr. xi., 4)—is specially verified by the voice and the continued work of the Church. For she, mother and nurse of sanctity that she is, ever rejuvenated and rendered fruitful by the breath of “the Holy Spirit who dwells within us” (Rom. viii., 11), as she alone generates, nourishes and brings up within her bosom the most noble family of the just, so, too, she is the most solicitous, by an instinct as it were of maternal love, in preserving their memory and in stimulating love for them. And from this remembrance she derives a comfort that is almost divine and that draws her eyes from the miseries of this mortal pilgrimage to see in the saints “her joy and her crown,” to recognize in them the sublime image of her heavenly Spouse, and to inculcate upon her children with new evidence the old truth: “To them that love God all things work together unto good, to such as, according to His purpose, are called to be saints.” (Rom. viii., 28.) And their glorious works are not only a comfort to the memory, but a light for imitation and a strong incentive to virtue through that unanimous echo of the saints which responds to the voice of Paul: “Be ye followers of me, as I also am of Christ.” (I. Cor. iv., 16.)

For these reasons, Venerable Brothers, when we immediately on our elevation to the Supreme Pontificate made known our intention of working constantly that “all things might be restored in Christ,” in our first encyclical letter (Litt. Encycl. “E supremi” die IV. m. October MCMIII.), we studied earnestly to make all turn their eyes with us to Jesus, “the Apostle and Pontiff of our confession, the Author and Finisher of our faith.” (Hebr. iii., 1; xii., 2-3.) But since our weakness is such that we are apt to be confounded by the great-

ness of such an Exemplar, we had, through the kindness of Divine Providence, another model to propose, one who while being as close to Christ as it is possible for human nature to reach, is better adapted to our weakness—namely, the ever Blessed Virgin, the august Mother of God. (Litt. Encycl. “Ad diem illum,” die II. m. Februar, MCMIV.) Moreover, availing ourself of various occasions to revive the memory of the saints, we have held up for universal admiration those faithful servants and ministers in the house of God, and each in his proper degree those friends of His and members of His household, “who by faith conquered kingdoms, wrought justice, obtained promises” (Hebr. xi., 33), that we might be urged on by their example “that henceforth we be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine by the wickedness of men, by cunning craftiness, by which they lie in wait to deceive; but doing the truth in charity, we may in all things grow up in Him who is the head, even Christ.” (Eph. iv., 11 seq.)

This most lofty design of Divine Providence we showed forth as realized in the highest degree in three personages who flourished as great doctors and pastors at periods far apart, but each of them almost equally calamitous for the Church—Gregory the Great, John Chrysostom and Anselm of Aosta, whose solemn centenaries have fallen in these latter years. Thus more especially in the two encyclical letters given on March 12, 1904, and on April 21, 1909, we expounded those points of doctrine and precepts of Christian life, which seemed to us to be suitable for our own times and which are to be found in the example and teaching of these saints.

And since we are persuaded that the illustrious examples set by the soldiers of Christ are far better calculated to stir and draw souls than words or deep treatises (Encycl. “E supremi”), we now gladly avail ourself of another happy opportunity which is presented to us to commend the most useful lessons to be drawn from another holy pastor raised up by God in times nearer to our own and amid tempests almost identical with those through which we are passing, that Cardinal of Holy Roman Church and Archbishop of Milan, Charles Borromeo, by Paul V. of holy memory numbered among the saints. And not less better adapted to our purpose, for, to quote the words of our predecessor, “the Lord, who alone works great wonders, has done magnificent things with us in these latter times, and in His wonderful dispensation He has erected a great luminary above the apostolic rock, by choosing Charles from the bosom of the Most Holy Roman Church to be a faithful priest, a good servant, a model for the flock and model for pastors; who, lighting up the whole Church with the varied brilliancy of his holy works, shines out before priests and people as an Abel in innocence, an Enoch in purity,

a Jacob in bearing labors, a Moses in meekness, an Elias in burning zeal; who shows forth in himself for our imitation the authority of a Jeremias, amid an abundance of luxuries, the humility of a Martin in its highest grade, the pastoral solicitude of a Gregory, the liberty of an Ambrose, the charity of a Paulinus; who, in fine, gives us to see with our eyes and to touch with our hands a man who, while the world smiles with all its blandishments upon him, lives crucified to the world, lives of the spirit, trampling earthly things underfoot, seeking continuously the things of heaven, and that not merely because by his office occupying the place of an angel, but because he strove on earth to think the thoughts and do the works of the life of the angels." (Ex Bulla "Unigenitus" Gal. Nov. anno MDCX.)

Thus our predecessor five lustres after the death of Charles. And now, three centuries after the glorification decreed to him, "with good reason are our lips full of joy and our tongue of exultation on the great day of our solemnity, whereon with the decreeing of the sacred honors to Charles, Cardinal Priest of the Holy Roman Church, over which by the disposition of the Lord we preside, a crown rich in all precious stones was given to his only Spouse." Thus we have in common with our predecessor the confidence that from the contemplation of the glory and still more from the teaching and example of the saints, the frowardness of the impious may be humiliated and confounded all those who "glory in the simulacrum of their errors." (Ex eadem Bulla "Unigenitus.") Thus the renewal of the glorification of Charles, model of the flock and of pastors in modern times, unwearied defender and advocate of the true Catholic reform against those innovators whose aim was not the restoration, but rather the deformation and destruction of faith and morals, will serve after three centuries as a source of special comfort and instruction for all Catholics and a noble incentive to them to coöperate strenuously in the work we have so much at heart of the restoration of all things in Christ.

It is certainly well known to you, Venerable Brothers, that the Church, although ever in tribulation, is never left by God wholly without consolation. "For Christ loved the Church and delivered Himself up for it, that He might sanctify it . . . and present it to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish." (Eph. v., 25 sqq.) Nay, when the licentiousness of morals is most unbridled, the onslaught of persecution most fierce and most cunning the wiles of error that seem to threaten her with utter ruin and that tear from her bosom not a few of her children, to plunge them in the vortex of impiety and vice, it is then that the Church finds Divine protection

more efficacious than ever. For, with or without the consent of the wicked, God makes error itself serve for the triumph of the truth, of which the Church is the defender and the guardian; makes corruption serve for the increase of sanctity, of which she is the nursing mother and mistress, and persecution serve for a more wonderful “freedom” from “our enemies.” And thus it happens that when to profane eyes the Church seems to be buffeted and almost submerged by the rage of the storm, it is then she comes forth fairer, stronger, purer, resplendent with the splendor of the greatest virtues.

In this way the supreme goodness of God ever confirms with new proofs that the Church is a Divine work, because in the most painful trial, that of the errors and sins which insinuate themselves in its very members, He makes her triumph in the combat, because He shows in it the truth of the words of Christ: “The gates of hell shall not prevail against it” (Matth. xvi., 18), because He proves by the reality the truth of the promise, “Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world” (Matth. xxviii., 20), and finally because He gives testimony of that mysterious virtue by which another Paraclete, promised by Christ immediately on His return to heaven, continually pours out His gifts upon it and defends and controls it in all tribulation; a “Spirit who abides with it forever; the spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not nor knoweth him . . . because he shall abide in you, and shall be in you.” (Ioan. xiv., 16 sqq.; xvi., 7 sqq.) From this fountain wells the life and force of the Church, and by this, too, as the ecumenical Vatican Council teaches, it is distinguished from all other societies by the manifest notes wherewith it is signalized and constituted “as a banner raised up among the nations.” (Sessio III., Const. “Dei Filius,” cau. 3.)

And truly, only a miracle of the Divine power could ensure that the Church, amid the flood of corruption and the lapses of its members, as the mystic body of Christ remains indefectible in the holiness of its doctrine, of its laws, of its end; from these same causes derives fruitful results; from the faith and justice of many of her children gathers most copious fruits of salvation. No less clear appears the seal of its divine life in that amid so vast and foul a mass of perverse opinions, amid such numbers of rebels, amid so multiform a variety of errors, it perseveres immutable and constant, “as the pillar and ground of truth,” in the profession of one and the same doctrine, in the communion of the same sacraments, in its divine constitution, in its government, in its morals. And this is all the more wonderful inasmuch as the Church not only resists evil, but “conquers evil with good,” and never ceases from blessing friends and enemies alike, while it works and yearns with all its soul to effect the Christian

renovation of society as well as of the individuals that compose it. For this is its special mission in the world, and of this its very enemies experience the benefit.

This wonderful influx of Divine Providence in the work of restoration promoted by the Church shines forth with splendor in that century which, for the comfort of the good, saw the appearance of St. Charles Borromeo. In those days passions ran riot and the knowledge of the truth was almost completely perverted and obscured; there was a continual struggle with errors, and human society, going from bad to worse, seemed to be rushing towards the abyss. In the midst of these errors rose up proud and rebellious men, "enemies of the cross of Christ . . . men of earthly sentiments, whose god is their belly." (Philip. iii., 18, 19.) These, bent not on correcting morals, but on denying the dogmas, multiplied the disorders, loosening for themselves and for others the bridle of licentiousness and contemning the authoritative guidance of the Church to pander to the passions of the most corrupt princes and peoples, with a virtual tyranny overturned its doctrine, constitution, discipline.

Then, imitating these sinners to whom was addressed the menace, "Woe to you who call evil good and good evil" (Isai. v., 20), that tumult of rebellion and that perversion of faith and morals they called reformation and themselves reformers. But in truth they were corrupters, for, undermining with dissensions and wars the forces of Europe, they paved the way for the rebellions and the apostasy of modern times, in which were united and renewed in one onslaught those three kinds of conflict hitherto separated, from which the Church had always issued victorious—the bloody conflicts of the first ages, then the internal pest of heresies, and finally, under the name of evangelical liberty, a vicious corruption and a perversion of discipline unknown perhaps in mediæval times.

To this crowd of seducers God opposed real reformers and holy men to arrest the impetuous current and extinguish the conflagration and to repair the harm already done. Their assiduous and manifold work for the reformation of discipline was all the more comforting to the Church by reason of the grave tribulation that afflicted it, and afforded a proof of the words, "God is faithful, who . . . also with temptation will make issue." (I. Cor. x., 13.) It was in these circumstances that by a providential disposition the singular zeal and sanctity of Charles Borromeo came to bring fresh consolation to the Church.

For God so ordained that his ministry was to have a force and efficacy all its own not only in checking the audacity of the factious, but in teaching and kindling the children of the Church. He curbed

the mad ardors of the former and refused their futile charges with the most powerful eloquence, by the example of his life and labors; he raised the hopes of the latter and revived their zeal. And it was truly wonderful how from his youth he united in himself all those qualities of the real reformer, which in others we see scattered and isolated—virtue, sense, doctrine, authority, power, alacrity—and how he combined them all to serve for the defense of Catholic truth against the onrush of heresies, as is the proper mission of the Church, reviving the faith that had grown dormant and almost extinct in many, strengthening it by provident laws and institutions, restoring the discipline that had been dethroned, and strenuously leading back the morals of the clergy and people to the tenor of Christian life. Thus, while he accomplishes all the offices of the reformer, he also duly discharges all the functions of the “good and faithful servant,” and later those of the great priest who “pleased God in his days and was found just,” and therefore worthy to be taken as an example by all classes of persons, clergy and laity, rich and poor; like those whose excellence is summarized in the encomium of Bishop and prelate, by which beyond the words of the Apostle Peter he made himself a “pattern of the flock from the heart.” (I. Petr. v., 3.) No less admirable is the fact that Charles, before reaching the age of twenty-three, although raised to the highest honors and entrusted with important and most difficult affairs of the Church, made daily progress in the more perfect exercise of virtue, through that contemplation of Divine things which in sacred retirement had already renewed him, and he shone forth “a spectacle to the world, to the angels and to men.”

Then, indeed, to use again the words of our predecessor, Paul V., the Lord began to show forth in Charles “His wonders”—wisdom, justice, burning zeal in promoting the glory of God and the Catholic name, and above all things solicitude for that work of restoration of the faith and of the universal Church which was treated in the august gathering of Trent. The Pontiff himself and all posterity assigned to him the merit of the celebration of this Council, inasmuch as he, before becoming the most faithful executor of it, was its most efficacious promoter. Indeed, were it not for his many vigils, trials and labors, that work would not have attained its ultimate completion.

And yet all these things were but a preparation and a novitiate, in which his heart was trained with piety, his mind with study, his body with labor, while he always kept himself, modest and humble youth that he was, as clay in the hands of God and God’s Vicar on earth. A life of preparation such as this was just the kind to be despised by the innovators of the time, through that same foolishness

which leads the modern innovators to despise it, in their failure to observe that the wonderful works of God are brought to maturity in the shade and silence of the soul dedicated to obedience and prayer, and that in this preparation lies the germ of future progress as the hope of the harvest lies in the sowing.

The sanctity and laboriousness of Charles, who was then preparing himself under such auspices, developed in due course to produce marvelous fruit, as we have hinted already, when he, like the good workman he was, leaving the splendor and majesty of Rome, retired to the field that he was to cultivate in Milan, and discharging all his offices there better and better every day, brought it to such splendor, from the state of rank growths and wildness to which the evil times had so deplorably reduced it, as to make the Church of Milan a most brilliant example of ecclesiastical discipline. (Ex Bulla "Unigenitus.")

All these striking results he attained by adopting in his work of reformation the rules laid shortly before by the Council of Trent.

For the Church, knowing how well "the imagination and thought of man's heart are prone to evil" (Gen. viii., 21), never ceases to combat vice and error that "the body of sin may be destroyed, to the end that we may serve sin no longer." (Rom. vi., 6.) And in this conflict, as she is a mistress to herself and guided "by the grace which is diffused in our hearts by the Holy Ghost," so she is governed in her thought and action by the Doctor of the Gentiles, who says: "Be ye renewed in the spirit of your mind. And be not conformed to this world, but be reformed in the newness of your mind, that you may prove what is the good and the acceptable and the perfect will of God." (Rom. xii., 2.) And the son of the Church and true reformer never persuades himself that he has attained the goal, but with the Apostle only protests that he is striving towards it: "Forgetting the things that are behind, and stretching myself to those that are before, I press towards the mark, to the prize of the supernal vocation of God in Christ Jesus." (Philip. iii., 13, 14.)

Thus it is that, united with Christ in the Church, "we in all things grow up in Him who is the head, even Christ, from whom the whole body maketh its own increase unto the edifying of itself in charity" (Ephes. iv., 15, 16), and Mother Church realizes more and more that mystery of the Divine will "in the dispensation of the fullness of times to reëstablish all things in Christ." (Ephes. i., 9, 10.)

No thought was given to all this by the reformers opposed by St. Charles, for they presumed to reform faith and discipline at their own caprice; nor is it better understood, Venerable Brothers, by the Moderns, against whom we have to combat to-day. These, too,

subvert the doctrine, laws, institutions of the Church, forever talking about culture and civilization, not because they have this so much at heart, but because under such sounding words they are enabled the better to conceal the evil nature of their designs.

Their real aims, their plots, the line they are following are well known to all of you, and their designs have been denounced and condemned by us. What they propose is a universal apostasy from the faith and discipline of the Church, an apostasy still worse than the one which threatened the century of Charles, from the fact that it creeps insidious and hidden in the very veins of the Church and with extreme subtlety pushes erroneous principles to their extreme conclusions.

But both have the same origin in “the enemy who,” ever alert for the perdition of men, “has oversowed cockle among the wheat” (Matth. xiii., 25); of both revolts the ways are hidden and darksome, with the same development and the same fatal issue. For as in the past the first apostasy, turning to the side on which fortune seemed to favor it, stirred up the powerful against the people or the people against the powerful only to lead both classes to destruction, so this modern apostasy stimulates mutual hatred between the poor and the rich until people growing discontented with their lot lead lives more and more miserable and pay the penalty imposed on all who, absorbed in earthly and fleeting things, seek not “the kingdom of God and His justice.” Nay, the present conflict has become all the more grave from the fact that while the turbulent innovators of other times as a rule retained some fragments of the treasure of revealed doctrine, the Moderns would seem to have no peace until they have utterly destroyed it. Now, once the foundations of religion are thus overturned, the bonds of civil society are also necessarily broken. Truly a spectacle full of sadness for the present and of menace for the future; not because there is any ground for fears as to the safety of the Church, for here the Divine promises do not permit of doubt, but for the dangers that threaten the family and the nations, especially for those who foment with most activity or who tolerate with most indifference this pestiferous wind of impiety.

Amid so impious and so stupid a war, carried on sometimes and propagated with the aid of those who should be the first to support us and help our cause; amid this manifold transformation of error and these varied blandishments of vice, by both of which many even of our own allow themselves to be led astray, seduced as they are by the appearances of novelty and of doctrine, or by the illusion that the Church may well come to a friendly agreement with the maxims of the age, you are well aware, Venerable Brothers, that we must all oppose a vigorous resistance and repel the assault of the enemy with

those very weapons which Charles Borromeo used in his own time.

And first of all, since they are attacking the very rock of faith, either by open denial, or by hypocritical assault, or by misrepresenting revealed doctrine, we shall do well to remember what St. Charles often inculcated, viz., that "The first and chief care of pastors must be concerned with all that regards the full and inviolate maintenance of the Catholic faith, the faith which the Holy Church professes and teaches, and without which it is impossible to please God." (Conc. Prov. i., sub initium.) And again: "In this matter no diligence can be too great to meet what are certainly the requirements of the case." (Conc. Prov. v., Pars. i.) Hence it is necessary to oppose sound doctrine to "the leaven of heretical depravity," which if not repressed corrupts the whole mass; that is, we must oppose the perverse opinions which are making their way under lying semblances and which taken together are professed by "modernism," remembering with St. Charles "how supreme must be the zeal and how diligent above all else must be the care of the Bishop to combat the crime of heresy." (Conc. Prov. v., Pars. i.)

In truth, it is not necessary to record the other words of the saint in quoting the sanctions, laws, penalties laid down by the Roman Pontiffs against prelates who are negligent or remiss in purging their dioceses of the evil of heresy. But it will be quite opportune to mediate closely on the conclusions he draws from these: "Hence the Bishop must above all things persevere in this eternal solicitude and continuous vigilance not only to prevent the most pestilent disease of heresy from penetrating among the flock committed to him, but even to remove the faintest suspicion of it from them. And should it happen to penetrate, which may the Lord Christ in His pitiful mercy forbid, he must strive at once by all means in his power to have it driven out immediately, and he must have those who are infected or under suspicion of being infected with the pestilence treated according to the pontifical canons and sanctions." (Conc. Prov. v., Pars. i.)

But neither liberation nor preservation from the pest of error is possible except through proper instruction of the clergy, for "faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of Christ." (Rom. x., 17.) This necessity of inculcating the truth upon all is more than ever urgent in our days, when through all the veins of the State, and from sources whence it might have been least expected, we see the poison penetrates to such a degree that all come within the scope of the reasons alleged by St. Charles in these words: "If those who live close to the heretics be not firm and well-grounded in the foundations of the faith, there is only too much reason to fear that they will easily allow themselves to be drawn by them into some snare

of impiety or false doctrine.” (Conc. Prov. v., Pars. i.) For nowadays owing to the facility of travel the means of communication have been increased for error as well as for all other things, and by reason of the unbridled liberty of the passions we live in the midst of a perverted society, in which “there is no truth . . . and the knowledge of God does not exist” (Os. iv., 1); “in a land that is desolate . . . because no one thinketh in the heart.” (Ierem. xii., 11.) Hence we, to use the words of St. Charles, “have hitherto employed much diligence to ensure that the faithful of Christ all and several be well instructed in the rudiments of the Christian faith” (Conc. Prov. v., Pars. i.), and have written a special encyclical letter on the subject as being one of the most vital importance. (Encycl. “Acerbo nimis,” die XXV. m. Aprilis MDCCCCV.) But although we do not wish to repeat what Charles Borromeo in his burning zeal lamented, that “we have hitherto obtained all too little success in a matter of such moment,” yet, like him, “swayed by the vastness of the undertaking and of the danger,” we would still further kindle the zeal of all, to the end that, taking Charles as their model, they may contribute, each in his grade and according to his strength, in this work of Christian restoration. Let fathers and employers remember with what fervor the holy Bishop constantly inculcated upon them not only to afford the opportunity, but to impose the obligation of learning Christian doctrine upon their children, servants and employes. Let clerics remember that they must help the parish priests in this teaching, and let the parish priests have schools for the purpose multiplied according to the number and the necessities of their people, and see to it that they be commendable in the probity of the teachers, who should be assisted by men and women of tried morality, after the method prescribed by the holy Archbishop of Milan. (Conc. Prov. v., Pars. i.)

The necessity of this Christian instruction is obviously increased both by the trend of modern times and customs, and especially by the existence of those public schools, destitute of all religion, in which everything most holy is ridiculed and condemned, and in which the lips of the teachers and the ears of the scholars are equally open to blasphemy. We speak of those schools which with supreme injustice are called “lay” or “neutral,” but which in reality are the prey of the domineering tyranny of a darksome sect. This new trick of hypocritical liberty you have already denounced aloud and fearlessly, Venerable Brothers, especially in those countries where the rights of religion and of the family have been most shamelessly trampled upon, and in which the very voice of nature, proclaiming that the faith and innocence of youth must be respected, has been stifled. To remedy, as far as was possible for us, so great an evil inflicted by

those same persons who while they claim obedience to themselves deny it to the Supreme Master of all things, we have recommended that schools of Christian doctrine be established in the various cities. And while this work, thanks to your efforts, has already made good progress, still it is earnestly to be desired that it be propagated even more widely, and that these schools be established numerously everywhere, and be provided with teachers of sound doctrine and good life.

These same qualities are with much greater reason to be looked for in the sacred orator whose office is closely connected with that of the necessary instruction in the first elements of religious teaching. Hence the diligence and the counsels of Charles in the provincial and diocesan synods were directed with a most special care to the formation of preachers who might be employed with holy zeal and good fruit in "the ministry of the word." And this, too, and perhaps even more urgently, seems to be required in the times in which we live, when the faith is weakening in so many hearts, and when there is no lack of those who in a spirit of vainglory follow the fashions, "adulterating the word of God" and depriving souls of the food of life.

With the utmost vigilance, therefore, Venerable Brothers, we must see to it that our flock be not fed on wind by vain and frivolous men, but be nourished with life-giving food by "ministers of the word," of whom it may be said: "Of Christ we are ambassadors, God as it were exhorting by us: Be reconciled to God (II. Cor. v., 20), not walking in craftiness, nor adulterating the word of God, but by manifestation of the truth commanding ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God (II. Cor. iv., 2); workmen that need not to be ashamed, rightly handling the word of truth." (II. Tim. ii., 15.) Not less useful for us will be those most holy and most fruitful rules which the Bishop of Milan was accustomed to lay down for the faithful and which are summarized in the words of St. Paul: "When you had received from us the word of the hearing of God you received it not as the word of men, but (as it is indeed) the word of God, who worketh in you who have believed." (I. Thess. ii., 13.)

Thus "the word of God, living and effectual and more piercing than any two-edged sword" (Hebr. iv., 12), will work not only for the conservation and defense of the faith, but as an efficacious impulse to good works, for "faith without works is dead (Iacob. ii., 26), for not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified." (Rom. ii., 13.)

Here, too, we see again how immense is the difference between real and false reform. For those who advocate the false, imitating

the inconstancy of the foolish, are wont to rush to extremes, either by exalting faith in such a way as to exclude good works, or ascribing to nature alone all the excellence of virtue without the aid of faith and divine grace. Whereas the acts proceeding from merely natural uprightness are but the simulacra of virtue, neither lasting in themselves nor sufficient for salvation. The work of such reformers, therefore, is not adapted to restore discipline, but is fatal to faith and morals.

On the other hand, those who, like St. Charles, sincerely and straightforwardly seek true and salutary reform, avoid extremes and never outstep those limits beyond which true reform cannot subsist. United as they are in the closest links with the Church and its Head, Christ, they not only derive thence strength for their interior life, but learn rules for their public action to enable them to devote themselves with sure purpose to the work of healing human society. Now, of this divine mission, transmitted perpetually to those who have to be the legates of Christ, it is the function “to teach all nations,” and not only the things that are to be believed, but the things that are to be done, that is, as Christ Himself said: “Observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.” (Matth. xxviii., 18-20.) “For He is the way, the truth and the life” (Ioan. xiv., 6), and He came that men “may have life and have it more abundantly.” (Ioan. x., 10.) But since to fulfill all those duties with the sole guidance of nature is something far beyond what the forces of man can by themselves attain, the Church possesses, together with her magisterium, the power of governing human society and that of sanctifying it, while she communicates the opportune and necessary means of salvation through those who, in their several grades and offices, are her ministers and coöperators.

Understanding this well, the true reformers do not kill the blossom in order to save the root, that is, they do not separate faith from holiness of life, but foster both of them and warm them with the breath of charity, which is “the bond of perfection.” (Coloss. iii., 14.) Thus, obeying the Apostle, do they “keep the deposit” (I. Tim. vi., 20), not to obstruct its manifestation or dim its light for the nations, but rather to send farther and wider the most saving waters of truth and life which well from that spring. And in this they combine theory with practice, availing themselves of the former to prevent all the “wiles of error,” and of the latter to apply the precepts to the morals and action of life. Therefore, too, they provide all the means opportune or necessary for the attainment of the end, both as regards the extirpation and “for the perfection of the saints, for the work of the ministry, the building up of the body of Christ.” (Eph. iv., 12.) This was the scope of the statutes, the canons, the

laws of the Fathers and Councils, and all those means of instruction, government, sanctification and beneficence of all kinds, and, in fine, all the discipline and activity of the Church. On such masters as these of faith and morals the true son of the Church fixes his eyes and his heart when he aims at the reformation of himself and others. And on such masters, too, Borromeo relies in his reformation of ecclesiastical discipline. He often refers to them, as when he writes: "We, following the ancient custom of the Holy Fathers and the sacred Councils, and especially of the Ecumenical Synod of Trent, have laid down many dispositions concerning these same points in our preceding provincial Councils." (Conc. Prov. v., Pars. i.) So, too, in making provision for the suppression of public scandals, he declares that he is guided "both by the law and by the sacred sanctions of the sacred canons, and, above all, of the Council of Trent." (Conc. Prov. v., Pars. i.)

And not content with this, in order the better to ensure that he may never depart from this rule, he is wont to conclude the statutes of his provincial Synods thus: "The things all and single which have been decreed and done by us in this provincial Synod, we submit always, to be amended and corrected, to the authority and judgment of the Roman Church, of all churches the Mother and Mistress." (Conc. Prov. vi., sub finem.) And this purpose of his he showed forth ever more fervently as he advanced with giant strides in the perfection of the active life, not only while the Chair of Peter was occupied by the Pontiff who was his uncle, but also under the successors of the latter, Pius V. and Gregory XIII. The election of these he powerfully aided, and he supported them strenuously in their great undertakings, corresponding perfectly with what they expected from him.

But above all did he second them in putting into execution the practical means to attain the end in view, viz., the real reform of sacred discipline. Here again he showed himself as far as possible removed from the false reformers who mask their obstinate disobedience under an appearance of zeal. Beginning "the judgment of the house of God" (I. Peter iv., 17), he applied himself first of all to reform the discipline of the clergy by constant laws, and to this end erected seminaries for the students for the priesthood, founded a congregation of priests known as Oblates, united religious families ancient and modern, assembled Councils, and by provisions of all kinds assured and developed the work that had been undertaken. Then, without delay, he set his hand with equal vigor to reform the morals of the people, regarding as said to himself what was said to the Prophet: "Lo, I have set the . . . to root up, and to pull down, and to waste, and to destroy, and to build, and to plan." (Ier.

i., 10.) Thus the good shepherd that he was, visiting personally the churches of the province, not without fatigue, like the Divine Master “he went about doing good and healing” the wounds of the flock; he put forth every effort to suppress and eradicate the abuses he met on all sides, due either to ignorance or the neglect of the laws; to the perversion of ideas and the corruption of morals that abounded he raised up barriers in the form of the schools and colleges he opened for the children and for youth, the Marian societies which he developed after having seen them in their early flowering here in Rome, the hospices he threw open for the orphans, the refuges he established for girls in danger, for widows, for mendicants, for men and women rendered destitute by sickness or old age, by his protection of the poor against the tyranny of masters, against usurers, against the enslaving of children, and by great numbers of other institutions. But all this he effected shunning entirely the methods of those who would renew human society after their own fashion by overturning everything, by agitation, by vain noise, forgetting the Divine words: “The Lord is not found in commotion.” (III. Reg. xix., 11.)

Just here is another point in which the real reformers differ from the false, as you, Venerable Brothers, have often experienced. The false reformers “seek their own interests, not those of Jesus Christ” (Philip. ii., 21), and giving ear to the insidious invitation once made to the Divine Master, “Manifest thyself to the world” (Ioan. vii., 4), they also repeat the ambitious words, “Let us also get us a name,” and by this temerity, which we have, alas! to deplore in our own time, “some priests fell in battle, wishing to do great things they went out without prudence.” (I. Machab. v., 57, 67.)

The true reformer, on the contrary, “seeks not his own glory, but the glory of Him who hath sent him” (Ioan. vii., 18), and like Christ, his exemplar, “he shall not contend nor cry, and his voice shall not be heard abroad, he shall not be turbulent or unquiet” (Isai. xlii., 2 sq.; Matth. xii., 19), but he shall be “meek and humble of heart.” (Matth. xi., 29.) Hence he will please the Lord and bear most copious fruits of salvation.

In still another way are they distinguished from one another, for the false “trusteth in man and maketh flesh his arm” (Ier. xvii., 5), while the true reformer puts all his trust in God and looks to Him and to supernatural assistance for all his strength and virtue, exclaiming with the Apostle: “All things I can do in Him who strengtheneth me.” (Philip iv., 13.)

These aids, which Christ communicated in rich abundance, the faithful reformer looks for in the Church itself, to which they have been given for the salvation of all, and among them especially

prayer, sacrifice, the sacraments, which become "a fountain of water springing up to life everlasting." (Ioan. iv., 14.) But all such means are repugnant to those who by crooked ways and in forgetfulness of God busy themselves with reformation and who never cease trying to render turbid or dry up altogether those crystal springs, so that the flock of Christ may be deprived of them. And here they are even surpassed by their modern followers, who under a mask of the deepest religiousness hold in no account these means of salvation, and throw discredit on them, especially the two sacraments by which sin is pardoned for penitent souls and souls are strengthened with celestial food. Let all faithful pastors, therefore, endeavor with all zeal to ensure that benefits of such great price be held in the highest honor, nor suffer these two works of Divine charity to languish in the affections of men.

Such was the conduct of Borromeo, among whose writings we read: "Since the fruit of the sacraments is so great and so abundant that its value cannot easily be explained, they should be treated and received with the utmost diligence, with the deepest piety of the soul and with external cult and veneration." (Conc. Prov. i., Pars. ii.) Most worthy of note also are the recommendations with which he exhorts parish priests and preachers to revive the ancient practice of frequent communion, as we have also done by our decree, "Tridentina Synodus." "Parish priests and preachers," says the holy Bishop, "should exhort the people as often as possible to the most salutary practice of receiving the Holy Eucharist frequently, relying on the institutions and examples of the early Church, on the recommendations of the most authoritative Fathers, on the doctrine of the Roman Catechism, which treats of this matter at length, and finally on the teaching of the Council of Trent, which would have the faithful communicate in every Mass, not only by receiving the Eucharist spiritually, but also sacramentally." (Conc. Prov. iii., Pars. i.) He describes, too, the intention and affection with which this sacred banquet should be approached, in these words: "The people should not only be incited to receive the Most Holy Sacrament frequently, but should also be warned how dangerous and fatal it is to approach unworthily this sacred table of Divine food." (Conc. Prov. iv., Pars. ii.) The same diligence would seem to be especially necessary in our times of vacillating faith and charity grown cold in order that the increase in frequency may not be accompanied by a diminution in the reverence due to so great a mystery, but that rather it may bring with it a motive to make "man prove himself and so eat of that bread and drink of that chalice." (I. Cor. xi., 28.)

From these founts will spring a rich stream of grace, which will give vigor and nourishment also to natural and human means. The

action of the Christian will by no means neglect the things that are of use and solace to life, for they, too, come from the same God, the Author of grace and of nature; but it will be careful when seeking and enjoying external things and the goods of the body not to make of them the end and happiness of life. He who uses these human things rightly and temperately, therefore, will employ them for the salvation of souls, in obedience to the words of Christ: “Seek first the kingdom of God and His justice and all these things will be added unto you.” (Luc. xii., 31; Matth. vi., 33.)

This properly ordered and wise use of the means is so far from being in opposition with happiness of a lower kind, viz., that proper to human society, that, on the contrary, it serves greatly to promote its interests; not by vain boasting, as is the fashion with factious reformers, but by deeds and by heroic striving, even to the sacrifice of property, strength and life itself. Many an example of this fortitude is given us by Bishops who, in evil days for the Church, vieing with the zeal of Charles, realize the words of the Divine Master: “The good shepherd gives his life for his sheep.” (Ioan. x., 11.) They are led to sacrifice themselves for the good, influenced not by ambition for glory, or by party spirit, or by the stimulus of any private interest, but by that “charity which never faileth.” Kindled by this flame, which escapes profane eyes, Borromeo, after having exposed his life in attending the victims of the plague, did not confine himself to affording aid against present evils, but turned his solicitude to those which the future might have in store: “It is altogether reasonable that just as an excellent father who loves his children with a single-hearted affection provides for their future as well as their present, by preparing for them what is necessary for their lives, so we, moved by the duty of paternal love, are making provision with all foresight for the faithful of our province and are preparing for the future those aids which we have known by experience during the time of the plague to be salutary.” (Conc. Prov. v., Pars. ii.)

The same designs and plans of affectionate forethought, Venerable Brothers, find a practical application in that Catholic action which we have frequently recommended. To take part in this most noble apostolate, which embraces all the works of mercy that are to be rewarded with the eternal kingdom (Matth. xxv., 34 sq.), the elite are called. But when they assume this burden they must be ready and fit to make a complete sacrifice of themselves and all things belonging to them for the good cause, to bear envy, contradiction and even the hatred of many who will repay their benefits with ingratitude, to labor like “good soldiers of Christ (II. Tim. ii., 3), to run by patience to the fight proposed to us, looking on Jesus, the author

and finisher of faith." (Hebr. xii., 1-2.) A conflict, assuredly, of great difficulty, but one that is most efficacious for the well-being of civil society, even though complete victory be slow in coming.

In this respect, too, it is given to us to admire the splendid example set by St. Charles and to derive from it, each according to his own condition, matter for imitation and comfort. For although his singular virtue, his marvelous activity and his abundant charity made him worthy of so much respect, yet even he was not exempt from the law: "All that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution." (II. Tim. iii., 12.) Thus the very fact that he led a very austere life; that he always stood up for righteousness and honesty; that he was an incorruptible defender of law and justice, brought upon him the hostility of powerful men and the trickeries of diplomats, caused him later to be distrusted by the nobility, the clergy and the people, and eventually drew upon him the deadly hatred of the wicked, so that his very life was sought. Yet, though of a mild and gentle disposition, he held out against all this with invincible courage.

Never did he yield in anything that would be hurtful to faith and morals or in the face of claims contrary to discipline or burdensome on the faithful, even when these were made by a most powerful monarch, who was also a Catholic. Mindful of the words of Christ, "Give unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's and to God the things that are God's" (Matt. xxii., 21), and of the declaration of the Apostles, "It is better to obey God rather than men" (Acts v., 29), he became a supreme benefactor not only of the cause of religion, but of civil society itself, which, paying the penalty of its foolish prudence and almost overwhelmed by the storms of sedition which itself had raised, was rushing upon certain destruction.

The same praise and gratitude will be due to the Catholics of our time and to their courageous leaders, the Bishops, when they never fail in any of the duties of good citizens, either when it is a question of showing loyalty and respect to "wicked rulers" when these command what is just, or resisting their commands when they are iniquitous, holding themselves equally aloof from the frowned rebellion of those who have recourse to sedition and tumult and from the servile abjection of those who receive as sacred laws the manifestly impious statutes of perverse men, who under the lying name of liberty subvert all things and impose on those subject to them the hardest kind of tyranny.

This is happening in the sight of the whole world and in the full light of modern civilization, in some nations especially, where "the powers of darkness" seem to have taken up their headquarters. Under this domineering tyranny all the rights of the children of the

Church are being trampled upon and the hearts of those in power have become closed to all those sentiments of generosity, courtesy and faith which for so long shone forth in their forefathers, who gloried in the name of Christians. But it is evident that where hatred of God and of the Church exists everything goes backward precipitously towards the barbarism of ancient liberty, or rather towards that most cruel yoke from which only the family of Christ and the education introduced by it has freed us. Borromeo expressed the same thought when he said: “It is a certain and well recognized fact that by no other crime is God more gravely offended, by none provoked to greater wrath, than by the vice of heresy, and that nothing contributes more to the ruin of provinces and kingdoms than this frightful pest.” (Conc. Prov. v., Pars. i.) Yet as far more deadly must be regarded the modern conspiracy to tear Christian nations from the bosom of the Church, as we have already said.

For the enemies of the Church, although in utter discord of thought and will among themselves, which is the sure mark of error, are at one only in their obstinate assaults upon truth and justice; and as the Church is the guardian and defender of both of those, against the Church alone they close up their ranks for an united attack. And although they are wont to proclaim their impartiality and to assert that they are promoting the cause of peace, in reality, by their mild words and their avowed intentions, they are only laying snares to add insult to injury, treason to violence. A new species of war is, therefore, now being waged against Christianity, and one far more dangerous than those conflicts of other times, in which Borromeo won so much glory.

By taking example and instruction from him we shall be animated to battle vigorously for those lofty interests upon which depends the salvation of the individual and of society, for faith and religion and the inviolability of public right; we shall fight, it is true, under the spur of a bitter necessity, but at the same time cheered by the fair hope that the omnipotence of God will speed the victory for those who fight so glorious a battle—a hope which gathers greater strength from the powerful efficacy, persisting down to our own days, of the work done by St. Charles both in humbling pride and in strengthening the resolution to restore all things in Christ.

And now, Venerable Brothers, we may conclude in the words with which our predecessor, Paul V., already several times mentioned, concluded the letter decreeing the supreme honors to Charles: “It is right, meanwhile, that we render glory and honor and blessing to Him who lives through all ages, who blessed our fellow-servant with all spiritual benediction to make him holy and spotless in His sight. And the Lord having given him to us a star shining this

right of sin and of our tribulation, let us have recourse to the Divine clemency, supplicating by mouth and deed that Charles, who loved the Church so ardently and helped her so greatly by his merits and example, may now assist her by his patronage, and in the day of wrath make peace for us through Christ our Lord." (Bulla "Unigenitus.")

To this prayer be added for the fulfillment of all hopes the token of the Apostolic Benediction, which with warm affection we impart to you, Venerable Brothers, and to the clergy and people of each one of you.

Given at Rome at St. Peter's, May 26, 1910, in the seventh year of our Pontificate.

PIUS X., POPE.

PIUS VII. AND THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.—VIII.

WHILE Pius VII., imprisoned in the palace of the Bishop of Savona and deprived of all means of communication with the faithful, still refused to confirm the Bishops who had been nominated by the Emperor, or to abandon his rights to the possessions of the Holy See, Napoleon had begun a deliberate persecution of the clergy in Italy, with the object, apparently, of subjecting the Church to his authority and of regulating its affairs "as if there were no Pope."¹ He began by establishing in Rome a board of functionaries called *la Consulta*, with the object of abolishing the laws and institutions existing under the Papal Government; of suppressing the religious orders; of reducing the numbers of the dioceses and parishes, and thus preparing the way for the introduction of the Constitution of the Empire, as in France, when he would send a Senator or a King to govern in his name.² The head of this committee was General Miollis, who had seized Rome and sent the Holy Father into exile. He was a brave soldier, but as an administrator, hesitating and undecided and easily led by his colleagues. These were Baron de Gerando, a member of the *Institut de France* and a writer on philosophical questions; Janet, a harsh and narrow-minded lawyer, who acted as Minister of Finance; dal Pozzo, a Piedmontese, who was charged with the organization of the courts of law, and Count Cesare Balbo, also a Piedmontese, the Secretary, who resigned his post at the end of 1810.

The task imposed on the *Consulta* of substituting for the ancient laws and traditional institutions of Rome those of modern revolutionary France presented serious difficulties; for a strong feeling of antipathy against the French had long prevailed among all classes in Rome on account of the frequent contests of the Kings of France with the Holy See and the disrespect with which their representatives had often treated the Sovereign Pontiffs. This aversion had been intensified by the impiety and the crimes of the Revolution; by the occupation of Rome by the troops of General Berthier; by the merciless pillage of its treasures, and the sanguinary reprisals by which every show of resistance to the republic had been suppressed. After the annexation, however, of the Papal States to the French

¹ Correspondance de Napoléon I. publiée par ordre de Napoléon III. Paris, 1866, t. XX., No. 16,381. Note pour le Ministre des Cultes. Compiègne 15 Avril, 1810. The Minister was ordered to draw up a plan regarding the affairs of the clergy, in which everything should be settled as it ought to be and as if there were no Pope.

² Louis Madelin, *La Rome de Napoléon. La Domination Française à Rome, de 1809 à 1814.* Paris, 1906, pp. 155, 206. This work is founded almost exclusively on inedited memoirs and State documents.

Empire, the majority of the Roman nobles soon yielded to the invitations or the threats of their new rulers, and, led by their ambition or their fears, consented to accept places in the administration of Rome and of the provinces. Some of them even were admitted to the French Senate or were given appointments at the Imperial Court.³

The clergy, as a rule, showed more strength of mind and greater fidelity to the Sovereign Pontiff. The cruel persecution which they underwent was not inflicted merely in consequence of their loyalty to their Pope as their temporal ruler; its chief motive was Napoleon's resolution to reduce the clergy to the condition of government functionaries, and to administer the affairs of the Church with the same absolutism as he exercised in those of the State.⁴ At the time when the two provinces which still remained to the Pope had been annexed and were changed into the two departments of the Tiber and Trasimene they were divided into thirty-two dioceses, a number which Napoleon thought much too large and which he hoped to be able to reduce to three or four, one of which should be the Diocese of Rome.⁵

Several of these sees were then vacant, but of the twelve Bishops then remaining in Umbria (the department of Trasimene) only three consented to take the oath; the others refused and were immediately sent off to France under an escort. Not only their ecclesiastical property, but that which they had inherited from their families was seized, and it was decreed that their dioceses should be united to those whose Bishops had taken the oath.⁶ In the province of Rome there were also twelve Bishops then present. Ten of them were induced to sign a document containing the oath by a stratagem of the Prefect, M. de Tournon, who appeased their scruples by allowing them to write beneath their signatures, "Saving the rights of the Church and of the Holy See." But even with this reservation two refused to sign. M. de Tournon then cut off this sentence and sent the document to the *Consulta*, making it appear that the oath had been taken without any reservation; but two more of these Bishops, on learning how they had been deceived, retracted at once. The others apparently thought it more prudent to make no complaint.⁷

³ Madelin, p. 100 . . . neuf nobles sur dix acceptent des places.

⁴ Le Comte Joseph Grabinski, *Les prêtres Romains et le premier Empire*. Lyons, 1897, p. 77.

⁵ Correspondance de Napoléon I., t. XX., No. 16,442, 7 Mai, 1810, and 16,554. Note pour le Ministre des Cultes, 13 Juin, 1810.

⁶ Léon Lecestre, *Lettres inédites de Napoléon I.* Paris, 1897, t. II., No. 612. Au Comte Bigot de Préameneu, Ministre des Cultes. Lacken, 16 Mai, 1810. (These letters had been omitted in the official "Correspondance de Napoléon I." as likely to create an unfavorable impression with regard to him.) Correspondance de Napoléon I., t. XX., No. 16,449. Au Ministre des Cultes, Berg-op-Loom, 9 Mai, 1810. Madelin, p. 335.

⁷ Madelin, p. 337.

Of the canons and parish priests who were asked to take the oath, a large number, it is true, gave way before the threats of the authorities. Some, perhaps, were allowed to swear with reservations that might satisfy their conscience. It may be, also, that in some rural districts less severity may have been displayed, but whatever may have been the number of those who yielded, several hundred priests preferred to undergo exile and imprisonment rather than fail to obey the Sovereign Pontiff, and of those who took the oath very many soon retracted and were deported like the others.⁸

It is not possible to ascertain the exact number of these confessors of the faith who were imprisoned in fortresses, exiled to Corsica or deported to various towns in the north of Italy, where they were subjected to an unceasing supervision on the part of the police and sometimes even forbidden to pass the gates of the city.⁹ While on their way they were venerated as martyrs by the people, who, though repulsed by the gendarmes, did not hesitate to manifest its indignation on seeing its Bishops and priests, many of them aged and infirm, sent into exile. Those who had yielded and had taken the oath were despised and avoided. No one would assist at their Mass or confess to them, until many of them, ashamed of their cowardice, retracted their oaths and were at once sent to rejoin those who had shown more firmness.¹⁰

The religious orders underwent the same persecution, for Napoleon had already announced his intention of suppressing them, and in the summer of 1810 thousands of monks were expelled from their houses and obliged to return to their families or lead a wandering life, taking the place of the priests who had been sent into exile and spreading among the people a spirit of hostility and resistance to the French. General Miollis spared only two orders—the *Fatibben-fratelli*, who served the hospitals, and the Scolopians, whose abolition would have closed a large number of schools. Only four

⁸ Grabinski, pp. 117, 128.

⁹ Grabinski, p. 132.

¹⁰ Mgr. Gregorio Tononi, in an article in "La Strenna Piacentina" for 1893, quoted by Grabinski, p. 115, has stated that between June 24 and November 29, 1810, 525 canons and priests were brought to Parma and Piacenza from the two provinces which had been just taken from Pius VII. From his researches in the archives of those towns he has estimated that about three hundred canons and five hundred parish priests were brought there, without reckoning those who were sent to Alessandria, Asti or Fenestrelles. (Grabinski, p. 126.) Madelin gives more details with regard to this persecution (pp. 340, 443, 523). According to his statements, in the course of the years 1810, 1811, 1812 and 1813 over thirteen hundred canons and parish priests belonging to the Papal States were exiled to towns in the north of Italy, imprisoned in fortresses or deported to Corsica for refusing to take the oath of allegiance to the Emperor, or for retracting it. The encyclical of Pius VII. prohibiting his subjects from taking this oath is mentioned in the QUARTERLY for July, 1909, p. 475.

religious houses were allowed to exist, where the more aged of the monks and nuns and those who had no home to which to return were permitted to take refuge.¹¹

The same spirit of loyalty to the Holy Father was manifested in a striking degree by the middle classes. Many of the Mayors of the villages and small towns of the two departments, as well as of their municipal councillors, gave in their resignation rather than take the oath of allegiance to the Emperor. In Rome, out of 1,200 *Curiali* or barristers, who were assembled at the Capitol in the month of May, 1810, and asked to take the oath, no less than 1,156 refused and were deprived of the right to practice their profession, a measure which rendered them still more hostile to the imperial government and more active in exciting animosity against it.¹²

Further unsuccessful attempts were made to induce the *Curiali* to submit, but in June, 1811, Napoleon declared that he was resolved to put an end to the state of affairs existing in Rome, which he felt was rendering him ridiculous, and he ordered that, beginning with the *Curiali*, all those who should refuse to take the oath should be arrested. Only fifty, however, seem to have fallen victims on this occasion.¹³ In November of the same year an imperial decree ordered a certain number of *Curiali* to be outlawed and deported to Corsica within twenty-four hours and their property, real and personal, to be confiscated.¹⁴ The same fate befell a large number of the employés in various government offices. Every class of society had its representatives in exile or in prison, and between January 1, 1811, and May, 1812, 307 persons were deported to Corsica for refusing the oath.¹⁵ In spite, however, of this severity, the majority of those from whom the oath was demanded still held back and refused to obey. The state of Rome was not, indeed, calculated to inspire its inhabitants with affection for the imperial government or make them forget the rule of the Popes. In flagrant contradiction to the brilliant promises with which the new administration had been inaugurated, the population of Rome, reduced from 135,000 to 123,000, had been plunged into the utmost misery by the absence of the Papal Court and of the Cardinals; by the transfer of the ecclesiastical tribunals; by the suppression of the religious orders, which had given work to many artisans and alms to large numbers of the poor, and by the increase of taxation. Napoleon, therefore, saw

¹¹ Madelin, pp. 326, 343.

¹² Madelin, pp. 356, 450.

¹³ Madelin, p. 450. Correspondance de Napoléon, t. XXII., No. 17,763. Au Général Savary Duc de Rovigo, Ministre de la Police générale. Chartres, 3 Juin, 1811.

¹⁴ Lecestre, t. II., No. 903, Au Général Savary. St. Cloud, 24 Novembre, 1811.

¹⁵ Madelin, p. 516.

the necessity of adopting still stronger measures to overcome this passive but obstinate resistance to his will. By a decree discussed at the Council of State on April 10, 1812, and published on May 4, those who should refuse to take the oath, after being granted a month's delay, were to be declared guilty of felony and deprived of the protection of the law; their property was to be confiscated, and they were to be tried by a special military commission and deported. A fresh outburst of persecution then took place in Rome, where General Miollis, who had until then shown a certain amount of moderation in his dealings with the clergy, now thought himself obliged to enforce the law without mercy. This severity caused the submission of many lawyers and functionaries, who consented at last to take the oath, but before the end of November, 1812, 322 ecclesiastics, over seventy of whom were canons, and 112 laymen were arrested and deported.¹⁶

An additional reason for this hostility to the imperial government was the law of conscription, which had been imposed on the Papal States as on the other countries annexed to the Empire, and had filled the people with terror and indignation. It was also one of the chief causes of the reappearance of brigandage, which at the end of 1809 was thought to have ceased to exist; for rather than serve in the armies of Napoleon, a large proportion of the conscripts preferred to take refuge in the woods and mountains and lead the life of outlaws. The yearly recurrence of the conscription augmented the number of brigands, who in the course of 1811 were masters of all the wilder districts, and it was only by the arrest of hundreds of their accomplices and of their relations and many executions that, towards the end of 1812, tranquillity was for a time restored. Brigandage was renewed on a larger scale in the course of the year 1813. In Umbria alone there were seventeen bands, while English cruisers bombarded the watch-towers along the coast, and on October 6 landed some troops at Porto d'Anzio, which drove out the garrison and burned the town.¹⁷

To neutralize the effect which the courageous resistance of the Abbé d'Astros to the nomination of Cardinal Maury as Archbishop of Paris might have had on the minds of the clergy, the Cardinal was charged with the preparation of an address to the Emperor on the part of the canons of Notre Dame. In this document, drawn up in agreement with the Emperor and worded so as to engage the chapter as much as possible in the dispute between the Emperor and the Pope with regard to the confirmation of Bishops, the canons were made to declare that they deeply regretted the conduct of their

¹⁶ Madelin, pp. 516, 523.

¹⁷ Madelin, pp. 310, 458, 468, 595, 614.

Vicar-Capitular, whose powers they had already revoked; that they were resolved to obey the laws of the Empire; that they adhered to the doctrines of the Gallican Church, and would maintain the four propositions of the declaration made by the clergy of France in 1682. The Cardinal then went on to assert, among other matters derogatory to the authority of the Holy See, that it had always been the custom in France for the chapters to confer on the Bishops when nominated by the sovereign all the capitular powers, that is to say, all their episcopal jurisdiction, and that it was in consequence of the advice given by Bossuet to Louis XIV. that the Bishops named by the King between the years 1682 and 1693 governed their dioceses in virtue of the powers conferred upon them by the chapters. These unfounded statements when read at a meeting of the chapter displeased some of the canons, who suggested various changes of the text, but the strongest opposition came from the Abbé Emery, the superior of the Seminary of St. Sulpice. He pointed out that there was no proof whatever in contemporary history that Bossuet had given the King such advice, and the Cardinal could only reply that as the King always consulted Bossuet on ecclesiastical matters, he had probably been also consulted with regard to that. The Cardinal consented, however, to make some variations in the text of the address, but the abbé refused to sign and withdrew at once from the meeting.¹⁸

The presentation of the address took place at the Tuilleries on Sunday, January 6, 1811, at the usual official reception after Mass. Canon Jalabert, who was to read it, received it only when in presence of the Emperor, and while reading it was surprised to find that the expression of their esteem for the Abbé d'Astros which the canons had wished to insert had been very much toned down, and that the passages which had been changed at the request of the Abbé Emery had been restored. It was thus the original text as drawn up by the Cardinal which was presented to the Emperor.¹⁹

Napoleon's reply took the form of a bitter denunciation of the Holy Father, whose hostility, he said, was caused by his not having been able to obtain when in Paris the suppression of the *Articles Organiques* and the restitution of the province of Romagna. Pius VII. had, moreover, refused to declare war against the English or to give canonical institution to the recently named Bishops, and he had excommunicated him. He then expressed his indignation that the Pope should have sent his briefs throughout the Empire, but the Abbé d'Astros, Mgr. Gregori and Padre Fontana, who had taken part in these intrigues, had been chastised. If the Pope would

¹⁸ Abbé Gosselin, *Vie de M. Emery.* Paris, 1862, t. II., p. 295.

¹⁹ Le Comte d'Haussonville, *L'Église Romaine et le premier Empire, 1800-1814.* Paris, 1868, t. IV., p. 14.

promise to respect the liberties of the Gallican Church, he would be free to return to Rome or to go elsewhere; though, indeed, if St. Peter, who left Antioch and preferred Rome to Jerusalem, because Rome was the greatest of cities and the abode of the Emperors, were to return to this world, it is not to Rome that he would go. "With regard to the canonical institution, since the Pope obstinately refuses to execute the Concordat, I, too, shall give it up. Such are my principles; make them known to your parish priests. They tend to the advantage of religion, and I shall never depart from them."²⁰

Napoleon was so pleased with the opinions expressed in this address that he required the chapters of all the Cathedrals of France and Italy to declare that they approved of them and accepted them, and during some months the columns of the official journal were filled with similar addresses, especially with those coming from the Italian clergy. The Pope was at that time cut off from all communication with the rest of the world, but M. de Chabrol, the Prefect of the department, took care that he should see these declarations of Gallicanism coming from a clergy which had always detested those doctrines. It was not until the fall of Napoleon that the violent and fraudulent methods employed to obtain these documents became known. In spite, indeed, of the solicitations and the threats of the local authorities, several chapters refused to send any address, but those which were sent were mutilated and corrupted so as to alter completely the sense of the original; many of them even were forgeries and proceeded from the office of the Council of the Viceroy of Italy.²¹

Napoleon then formed another ecclesiastical council, by whose advice he hoped to extricate himself from the difficulty caused by the Pope's refusal to confirm the Bishops he had nominated. It was composed of Cardinal Fesch, Archbishop of Lyons; Cardinal Maury, Archbishop of Paris; Cardinal Caselli, Bishop of Parma; de Barral, Archbishop of Tours; de Pradt, Archbishop of Malines; Bourlier, Bishop of Evreux; Duvoisin, Bishop of Nantes; Mannay, Bishop of Trèves, and the Abbé Emery. The last named, however, protested strongly against his nomination. He refused to take part in the deliberations of the committee, and consented to assist at them merely with consultative voice.

The instructions presented to the ecclesiastical council by M. Bigot de Préameneu in the name of the Emperor were a tissue of misrepresentations and were drawn up in the hostile tone usually adopted by

²⁰ D'Haussonville, t. IV., p. 21. Padre Ilario Rinieri, Napoleone e Pio VII. (1804-1813). Torino, 1906, t. II., p. 128.

²¹ Rinieri, t. II., p. 132. The protestations of the chapters against these addresses were published in 1816.

Napoleon when treating of the Holy See. They stated that the Emperor had always rejected the claims of the Pope to be the universal Bishop, although by the articles 3, 4 and 5 of the Concordat he had authorized him to act as such at that time on account of the extraordinary circumstances in which the Church of France was then placed. Since the Concordat, however, the Pope had acted as if he had absolute power over the Bishops, and it had thus become necessary to establish new boundaries between his pretensions and the independence of all nations. The Pope had also issued bulls of excommunication on account of temporal matters. He had sent briefs to the chapters of Florence, Paris and Asti forbidding them to exercise their authority by delegating it, and he had made Cardinal di Pietro his representative in France, with full powers, giving him thus a jurisdiction contrary to the principles which govern that Church. The Emperor had, therefore, resolved: Firstly, not to allow any communication between his subjects and the Pope until the latter had sworn not to do anything in France contrary to the four propositions of the Gallican Church as decided in the assembly of the clergy in 1682. Secondly, not to allow the existence of the episcopate in France to depend any longer on the canonical institution given by the Pope, who would thereby be master of the Bishops. The Emperor, therefore, trusted that the committee would let him know what measures to adopt so that the Church should not suffer by this interruption of communication, and that the Bishops should possess the qualification required for the exercise of their jurisdiction.²²

The members of the ecclesiastical commission were much grieved and alarmed by the animosity towards the Holy Father displayed in these instructions and by the responsibility cast upon them. M. Emery especially was so painfully affected that he implored of Cardinal Fesch to represent to the Emperor that it was impossible for the Bishops to adopt his views, and declared to him that as a Cardinal he was bound to resist, even unto death.²³ The Cardinal yielded to these observations, and his remonstrances made Napoleon feel that it would not be prudent to insist too strongly on the adoption of his views, but he requested the committee to answer the following questions which were submitted to it by M. de Préameneu: 1st. As all communication is now interrupted between the Pope and the Emperor's subjects, to whom should one apply to obtain the dispensations usually granted by the Holy See? 2d. If the Pope should persist in refusing to grant bulls to the Bishops named by the Em-

²² D'Haussonville, t. IV., pp. 74, 378. Instructions pour la Commission Ecclésiastique de 1811. 8 Février, 1811.

²³ Gosselin, t. II., p. 300.

peror, what would be the lawful method of giving them canonical institution?

The Bishops began their reply by expressing the profound grief they felt at the interruption of communications with the Pope, and they declared that if it were to be prolonged they foresaw a time of mourning and affliction for the Church. Having thus protested, though indeed much too feebly, against the imprisonment of Pius VII., the committee discussed the origin and the history of dispensations from the earliest times. Their conclusion was that when unfortunate circumstances interrupted the communication between the Pope and the Emperor's subjects, the faithful should apply to the Bishops for the dispensations usually granted by the Holy See.

In its reply to the second question the committee suggested that a clause should be added to the Concordat enacting that the Pope should give canonical institution within a certain time to the Bishops nominated, and that if he did not, the right to confer it should devolve on the provincial synod. If the Pope should refuse to consent to this modification of the Concordat, the best course to follow would be to reestablish the regulations of the pragmatic sanction drawn up in the assembly of Bourges in 1438, in accordance with the decrees of the Council of Bâle. In order to do so legally the committee advised the convocation of a national council, but expressed the desire that a deputation should previously be sent to the Holy Father to submit to him the wants of the French Church and enlighten him as to the true state of affairs.²⁴

Wishing to discuss these replies before adopting the measures they recommended, Napoleon summoned the members of the commission to meet him at the Tuileries on March 16, along with all the great dignitaries of the Empire. M. Emery, who did not intend to appear at the palace, was brought there by the express desire of Cardinal Fesch, who sent two Bishops to insist on his coming, to whose will he yielded very reluctantly, and only after praying fervently for the Divine guidance.

Napoleon's speech to the members of the ecclesiastical committee was an outburst of coarse abuse and calumnious accusations against the Papacy generally, and more especially against Pius VII., whom he accused of attacking his authority by excommunicating his Ministers and his armies, of weakening the affection and obedience of his subjects, and even of exposing him to be assassinated. He announced, therefore, his intention of assembling a council, at which the Bishops of Italy and Germany should assist. It would seek for the means of protecting his Empire from the animosity of the Court

²⁴ Rinieri, t. II., p. 142. Gosselin, t. II., p. 302. D'Haussounville, t. IV., p. 76.

of Rome, which would be persistently directed against his descendants as it had been against those of Charlemagne, until the Empire should be broken up, the French driven out of Italy and the temporal power reestablished; for it could only exist thenceforward by the destruction of the Empire. He could not, therefore, look on the Concordat as still in existence or accept the modification of it which had been suggested.²⁵

Such was the terror which Napoleon inspired that this torrent of falsehoods directed against the Holy Father drew forth no protest from the Cardinals and prelates to whom it was addressed. They remained silent. Napoleon then turned to M. Emery and asked him what he thought of the matter. M. Emery replied that his opinion was the same as that contained in the catechism which was taught by the Emperor's orders in all the churches of the Empire—namely, that the Pope is the visible Head of the Church, whom all the faithful must obey as the successor of St. Peter. How can a body exist without its Head, to whom by Divine right it owes obedience? He then pointed out to the Emperor that the preamble of the Declaration of 1682 asserts that the primacy of St. Peter and of the Roman Pontiff was instituted by Jesus Christ, and that all Christians owe him obedience. It also states that these four articles had been decreed lest, under pretext of the Gallican liberties, any attack should be made on this primacy. After some further explanations M. Emery concluded by proving that a council assembled without the consent of the Pope would be utterly invalid. To everybody's surprise, Napoleon showed no sign of anger on being thus contradicted, but said: "Well, I do not deny the spiritual power of the Pope, since he received it from Christ, but Christ did not give him the temporal power; it was Charlemagne who gave it to him, and as successor of Charlemagne, I shall take it from him, because he does not know how to make use of it, and it prevents him from exercising his spiritual functions." M. Emery replied by quoting the opinion of Bossuet, whom he knew that the Emperor highly respected and who, in his "Defense of the Declaration of the Clergy of France," maintains that the independence and the complete liberty of the Sovereign Pontiff are necessary for the free exercise of his spiritual authority in the whole universe and in such a multiplicity of kingdoms and empires. He then repeated word for word the text of Bossuet, calling attention especially to the passage, "We congratulate not only the Apostolic See, but also the Universal Church on its temporal sovereignty, and we desire most ardently that this sacred dominion may remain secure in every way." Napoleon listened patiently and

²⁵ Correspondance de Napoléon I., t. XXI., No. 17,478. Au Comité Ecclésiastique. Paris, 16 Mars, 1811.

remarked: "I do not reject the authority of Bossuet. All that was true in his time, when there were many rulers in Europe, it was unbecoming for the Pope to be subjected to any particular sovereign. But why should he not recognize my authority, since Europe now knows no other master?" It was a difficult matter to discuss, but M. Emery courageously answered that what Bossuet had foreseen might not happen under his reign or that of his successor, but that His Majesty was well acquainted with the history of revolutions, and knew that the actual state of affairs might not always exist. It was, therefore, better not to change a wisely established system. Napoleon then asked M. Emery if he thought that the Pope would accept the clause which the commission proposed to add to the Concordat—that after a certain delay the right of granting canonical institution should devolve on the provincial synod. M. Emery replied that he did not think that the Pope would make such a concession, as it would destroy his right of confirmation, and Napoleon, turning towards the Bishop, said: "You wanted me, therefore, to make a false step by asking the Pope for a thing that he could not grant me." On leaving the room Napoleon bowed to M. Emery and took hardly any notice of his colleagues. Some of them asked the Emperor to excuse M. Emery on account of his great age, but he assured them that he was not displeased with him, as he spoke like one who knew his subject. "It is thus that I like to be spoken to." M. Emery died, unfortunately, soon after (28th April, 1811), and in him the Emperor lost a councillor whose advice might, perhaps, have brought about a reconciliation with the Holy Father.²⁶

The impression produced by M. Emery's words on Napoleon's mind was only transitory. They did not make him relinquish his intention of subjecting the Church to his authority, but merely served to point out to him the difficulties of his enterprise and the precautions he should take to avoid creating a schism in France. He therefore resolved to make another attempt to induce the Pope to yield on the question of the confirmation of Bishops, and selected to negotiate at Savona with that object Mgr. de Barral, Archbishop of Tours; Duvoisin, Bishop of Nantes, and Mannay, Bishop of Trèves, to whom was added a little later Mgr. Bonsignori, Bishop of Faenza, recently named Patriarch of Venice. Before their departure he issued a circular for the convocation of a council, a step which he thought might intimidate the Holy Father. It was drawn up in the form of a denunciation of the acts of Pius VII., although his name was not mentioned. "The most illustrious and the most populous sees of the Empire are vacant; one of the parties to the Concordat has disowned it. The line of conduct followed in Germany

²⁶ Gosselin, t. II., p. 305. D'Haussounville, t. IV., p. 82.

since ten years has nearly destroyed the hierarchy there. . . . The chapters have been deprived of their right to provide for the administration of the diocese during its vacancy; plots have been made to excite discord and sedition. . . . More sees become vacant every day; unless prompt measures are taken the hierarchy will disappear in France and in Italy as in Germany. To prevent a state of affairs so contrary to the welfare of religion, to the principles of the Gallican Church and to the interests of the State, we have resolved to assemble on the 9th of June all the Bishops of France and Italy in a national council in the Church of Notre Dame, in Paris."²⁷

The three prelates received their instructions from the Emperor on April 26. He told them that he considered the Concordat as having ceased to exist, and the Bishops should be confirmed as they had been previous to the Concordat of Francis I. and in the manner which should be established by the council and with his approbation. He told them that he sent them to the Pope to put before him the misfortunes caused by the ignorance and obstinacy of his advisers; to enlighten him and to conclude two distinct agreements with him, if they found him in a reasonable state of mind. By the first of these the Emperor would consent to return to the Concordat on two conditions—firstly, that the Pope should confirm all the Bishops whom he had nominated, and, secondly, that if in future the Pope did not confirm a Bishop within three months after nomination, the metropolitan should do so, in the case of his suffragans, or, if he refused, the senior Bishop of the province.

By the second agreement the Emperor would allow the Pope to return to Rome, provided he took the oath which is prescribed by the Concordat, and which the Popes have always taken to the Emperors. If the Pope refused, he should not be allowed to return to Rome, but he might reside at Avignon, where he could direct the spiritual affairs of Christendom and be surrounded by the representatives of the Christian powers. He would receive sovereign honors and enjoy an income of two millions of francs; but he should promise to do nothing in the French Empire contrary to the four propositions of the Gallican Church. These instructions were to be carried out at once, as the Bishops should be back in Paris before June 1.²⁸ The envoys were not to mention the powers they had received from the Emperor unless they saw that the Pope was inclined to treat. They were supposed to have been deputed, by the permission of the Em-

²⁷ Correspondance de Napoléon I., t. XXII., No. 17,656. Circulaire pour la Convocation du Concile Nationale. Saint Cloud, 25 Avril, 1811.

²⁸ Correspondance de Napoléon I., t. XXII., p. 132. Instructions pour M. L'Archévêque de Tours, et M. M. les Évêques da Nantes et de Trèves. Saint Cloud, 26 Avril, 1811.

peror, to express the ideas of the Church of France, and they brought with them a letter signed by a large number of the Cardinals and prelates then in Paris, in which the Holy Father was assured that they were the representatives of the entire Gallican Church and were entitled to speak in its name.

The three Bishops had an audience of the Holy Father on May 10. They found him under the impression that the object of their mission was to inform him that he was to be judged by the Bishops assembled in Paris. They speedily calmed his fears, but on discussing the question of the council the Pope pointed out to them that without his concurrence this council would be absolutely nul, and that as it would be only national and not ecumenical, it would not have sufficient authority to make any change in the discipline of the Church. With regard to the confirmation of the Bishops nominated by the Emperor, he declared that it was impossible for him to act without the assistance of his advisers or the means of obtaining information with regard to the nominees.²⁹ In these negotiations the efforts made by the three prelates to induce the Holy Father to consent to the Emperor's demands were seconded by those of M. de Chabrol, who visited him in the intervals between the audiences and sought by various arguments to produce an effect on his mind. The same functionary also persuaded Dr. Porta, the Pope's physician, to let him know whatever the Pope might say in the course of a familiar conversation, and to contribute by his own suggestions to render him favorable to the negotiations.³⁰

De Chabrol, who in his letters to the Minister of Worship did not fail to boast of the activity and zeal which he displayed in the service of the Emperor, even used threatening language to the Holy Father. He told him that the Emperor would obtain from his council more than he was then asking, and warned him that his successors would blame him for having lost an opportunity so favorable to the Church, which would not recur again. He appealed also to his heart, and spoke of the sufferings which so many of the faithful were undergoing on his account, but the Holy Father showed what de Chabrol called "an incredible obstinacy" (*une obstination incroyable*). He cared little, he said, for what concerned himself; he was resigned to everything. As for the others, God would provide for them, but he

²⁹ Mgr. de Barral, *Fragments relatifs à l'histoire ecclésiastique*. Paris, 1815. (Quoted by d'Haussonville, t. IV., p. 125.)

³⁰ D'Haussonville, t. IV., pp. 128, 386. M. le Comte de Chabrol au Ministre des Cultes. Savone, 12 Mai, 1811. . . . "To-day has been employed in establishing an understanding with the interior of the palace so as to know what the Pope may let fall in familiar conversation, and to be able to let him know, if necessary, directly, though not officially, what it is well that he should learn in order to facilitate the negotiation. The Pope's doctor, M. Porta, serves us wonderfully well."

would never purchase the peace offered to him by the sacrifices demanded of him. De Chabrol was so incapable of understanding the reasons upon which the Holy Father founded his resistance that he ascribed it to "vanity (*amour-propre*) disguised under the form of scruples of conscience."³¹ Dr. Porta, also, to whom de Chabrol had pointed out the situation in which "his master was placing himself as well as all those who were attached to his cause," sought to influence the Holy Father's mind, for he informed him that he had learned that the entire population of Savona and of Genoa hoped that the Pope was about to yield and that he would soon be free.

The motives which determined Pius VII. to refuse to grant the Emperor's demands can be easily ascertained from the letters of the Bishops to the Minister of Worship. He objected to the proposal that the metropolitan should confer canonical institution after a delay of three months: Firstly, because the interval was too short; secondly, because in that case the Emperor alone would be the judge of the fitness of the nominees; thirdly, because the metropolitan would be made the judge of the refusal of the Holy See, and, fourthly, because he could not take upon himself in his isolation to make such a change in the Church.³² In order, however, to protect the vacant sees from the evils resulting from the want of their pastors, he consented to confirm the Bishops who had been nominated, but for that occasion only and under a new form, by granting to the metropolitans the faculties for confirming them, and deferring the definitive settlement of the question until the time when he should be free and his councillors should be restored to him, without whose assistance he declined to go a step further. The honor and the welfare of the Church would not allow him to take upon himself such a responsibility; he would prefer to pass his life in prison—"in carcere detrusus."³³

Pius VII. was, indeed, in prison; he was completely isolated from the rest of the world; he was kept in ignorance of what was taking place and was unable to consult any one whom he could trust. The delegated Bishops drew his attention more than once to "the fatal consequences for the Holy See and for the Church, which would be the result of his refusal to accede to the Emperor's demands and to the impending decision of the council, after which there would be

³¹ D'Haussonville, t. IV., p. 392. De Chabrol au Ministre des Cultes. Savone, 14 Mai, 1811. "Je mai rien gagné sur cette obstination incroyable." P. 397, de Chabrol au Ministre des Cultes. Savone, 18 Mai, 1811. "J'ai pu remarques qu'il était moins retnu par la conviction que par un amour-propre qui se déguise chez lui sous la forme d'inquiétude de conscience."

³² D'Haussonville, t. IV., p. 136. Second letter from the Bishops to the Minister of Worship, 12 May.

³³ Rinieri, t. II., pp. 161, 162. D'Haussonville, t. IV., p. 151. Seventh letter from the Bishops to the Minister of Worship, 17 May, 1811.

no more hope." It is not surprising that, yielding to this dread of the concessions which Napoleon might extort from the council and of the possibility of a schism in France, the Pope should have consented to allow the Bishops to submit to him once more, on the evening of May 18, the questions of canonical institution and of the clause to be added to the Concordat relating to it, contained in a note which they had already presented to him on the 14th, and which he had then refused to accept. The Bishops discussed these matters with the Holy Father, drawing up a rough sketch of the concessions they hoped to obtain from him, and on the following morning they brought him the fully developed document. The Pope changed some of the expressions, inserted some sentences and deleted others. The result, as the Bishops wrote to the Minister of Worship, "was rather good and much better than what they had hoped to obtain a few days previously." They took leave of the Holy Father that evening. He allowed them to leave a copy of this note on his table, but he did not sign it, and they left Savona on the morning of the 20th.³⁴

The document contained four articles. By the first the Pope consented to grant canonical institution to the Archbishops and Bishops nominated by the Emperor according to the forms agreed upon in the Concordats of France and Italy. The second agreed that a new Concordat should extend the same regulations to the churches of Tuscany, Parma and Piacenza. By the third the Pope allowed the insertion in the Concordats of a clause by which he would agree that, if after a delay of six months caused by any other motive than the unworthiness of the nominee, he still refused to grant the bulls, he would give the power of granting them, in his name, to the metropolitan of the vacant see, or, in his place, to the senior Bishop of the province. The fourth article was the most important, for in it the Holy Father explained that he had been led to make these concessions merely by the hope which his conferences with the delegated Bishops had given him that they would prepare the way for an arrangement which should restore order and peace in the Church and restore to the Holy See the liberty, the independence and the dignity which become it.³⁵

This unsigned draft of an agreement, which could be discussed and modified at some other time, when the Pope should be aided by the advice of the Sacred College and be free to negotiate, was all that the Bishops brought back to Napoleon, after subjecting the

³⁴ Rinieri, t. II., p. 164. D'Haussonville, t. IV., pp. 140, 152. Ninth letter from the Bishops to the Minister of Worship, May 19, 1811. Henri Welschinger, *Le Pape et l'Empereur* (1804-1815). Paris, 1905, p. 186.

³⁵ Rinieri, t. II., p. 166. Welschinger, p. 182.

Holy Father during ten days to an unceasing persecution by persuasion or intimidation to induce him to yield to the Emperor's demands. On the following morning, nevertheless, the Pope was so overcome by his scruples and by the fear that he had conceded more than was in his power, that he sent for Captain Lagorse, the governor of the palace, to inquire if the Bishops had left. He also asked for M. de Chabrol, and while waiting for him he told the captain that he had not paid attention to the last lines of the note left with him; that he could not agree to them, and that the Bishops should be at once informed of the fact by a courier.³⁶ When de Chabrol came he told him that there was an error in the first article, the form of which required to be changed, and a little later he said to him that in the last sentence of the document, which concerns the government of the Church, there was a trace of heresy; that he had never accepted that last article, and that a courier should be sent immediately to the Bishops to have it suppressed. To this de Chabrol consented, in order that "on their arrival in Paris they should know what was the state of affairs."³⁷

The Holy Father protested again on the following day that he had promised nothing; that he did not consider the note which had been left with him as a treaty or the preliminary to a treaty, but merely as a sketch, which indicated the result which might be attained if a different system were followed with regard to himself. The sufferings which these scruples caused him were so intense that his health became seriously affected. He passed sleepless nights; he frequently stopped while conversing and fell into a state of meditation, from which he awoke as from a dream. He protested that all he had done had been for the good of the Church and to obviate the danger of a schism. He even accused himself of having been guilty of an act of folly, but when informed of the approaching assembly of the council in Paris, he exclaimed: "Luckily, I have not signed anything!"³⁸

The opening of the council convoked by Napoleon had been deferred from the 9th to the 17th of June. Its president was Cardinal Fesch, who, though the prelates assembled at his house

³⁶ This evidently refers to the last lines of the third article. Welschinger, p. 189.

³⁷ Rinieri, t. II., p. 172. D'Haussonville, t. IV., p. 402. De Chabrol au Ministre des Cultes. Savone, 22 Mai, 1811. The courier overtook the Bishops at Turin. Welschinger, p. 191.

³⁸ D'Haussonville, t. IV., pp. 406, 407, 409. M. de Chabrol au Ministre des Cultes. Savone, 26 Mai, 1811, and 11 Juin, 1811. M. de Chabrol was not, however, justified in describing the state of mind of Pius VII. as "aliénation" (*insanity*), an expression adopted by d'Haussonville, but which Padre Rinieri and Welschinger have shown to be unjustifiable, and probably due to de Chabrol's irritation at the failure of his intrigues.

some days previously had been willing to elect him to that position, insisted on occupying it as a right; for, as Archbishop of Lyons, he ruled the most ancient diocese in France and bore the title of Primate of Gaul. Ninety-five prelates, six of whom were Cardinals, eight Archbishops and eighty-one Bishops, who, therefore, did not represent half the sees of France and Italy united, assisted at the Mass in the Cathedral of Notre Dame by which the council was inaugurated. The sermon, preached by Mgr. de Boulogne, Bishop of Troyes, had been previously submitted to Cardinal Fesch, who had requested him to suppress certain passages which seemed likely to displease the Emperor, but, carried away by his enthusiasm, the Bishop forgot his promise. He boldly protested that the Bishops assembled for the council "would never forget the love and the respect which they owed to the Church of Rome and to the Supreme Head of the episcopate, without whom it could only languish like a branch separated from the trunk or be tossed by the waves like a vessel without rudder or pilot." Mgr. Duvoisin, Bishop of Nantes, then read the decree for the opening of the council and the regulations for its guidance, and asked each Bishop if it pleased him that the council should be opened. To the usual "*Placet*" the Archbishop of Bordeaux, Mgr. d'Avian, added: "Saving the obedience due to the Sovereign Pontiff, an obedience to which I bind myself and which I swear." Cardinal Fesch then made the profession of faith in the form prescribed by the bull of Pope Pius IV., and administered the same oath to the other prelates, insisting that they should pronounce it distinctly, especially in the case of those who had belonged to the Constitutional Church.³⁹

The sermon of the Bishop of Troyes and the oath of obedience to the Pope were a cause of great irritation to Napoleon. He forbade any allusion to be made to them in the newspapers, and on the evening of the 19th, at Saint Cloud, he severely reprimanded Cardinal Fesch, on whom he cast the responsibility of what had occurred. In order to maintain a strict supervision over the council and influence it, he decided that M. Bigot de Préameneu and Count Marescalchi, the Ministers of Worship for France and Italy, should assist at its meetings as imperial commissioners. The reports which they sent the Emperor kept him well informed of everything that took place, and to facilitate their work it had been enacted that, contrary to the usual custom, French and not Latin should be the language employed. The imperial message to the council, which they read at the first general congregation on June 20, although slightly modified owing to the remarks and protestations of Cardinal

³⁹ Abbé Lyonnet, *Le Cardinal Fesch*. Paris, 1841, t. II., p. 329. D'Haussonville, t. IV., p. 210.

Fesch and of the ecclesiastical commission, to whom it had been submitted, was, like other manifestos of Napoleon, a bitter and mendacious attack on the Holy Father. He was accused of having maintained the Kingdom of Italy in a state of fermentation; he had wished that the restoration of Romagna should be the price of his consent to grant canonical institution to the Bishops nominated by the Emperor. The briefs sent to the chapters of Paris, Florence and Asti forbidding them to grant powers of administration to the Bishops named to those sees were described as attempts to excite disturbances in the Church and in the State. Napoleon took care not to allude to his annexation of Rome or to the captivity of the Holy Father at Savona, but he declared that as since ten years the Pope had not observed the Concordat, neither should he. He would provide for the succession of the episcopate in the way which the council should indicate. He ended by protesting that he would continue to protect religion, but that he would not allow the enemies of his government to make use of religion to create trouble in the State, or to preach false doctrines, or to alarm the consciences of his subjects, or to seek to destroy the hierarchy, and thus cause religion to decay on account of temporal interests.⁴⁰

This violent and calumnious speech produced a painful impression on the assembled Bishops, for it showed them clearly how little hope there was of effecting a reconciliation between the Pope and the Emperor. On the following day they elected the committees for transacting the business of the council, the most important of which was that for the preparation of the address to be presented to the Emperor.⁴¹ At its first meeting Mgr. Duvoisin, Bishop of Nantes, one of Napoleon's strongest partisans, read the draft of an address which he had drawn up and had already submitted to the Emperor for his approval. This draft, which was evidently intended to compromise the council, as it dwelt on all the questions which were then most ardently discussed, was severely criticized and somewhat modified by the committee. When read at the general meeting of the council on June 26 it drew forth a strong protestation from the Bishop of Chambery because it contained no demand for the liberty of the Holy Father. It was, as he said in an eloquent speech, the duty of the council to request the Emperor to grant it, and his words were received with enthusiasm by the majority of the Bishops. Cardinal Fesch, however, whom the Emperor had ordered not to allow the council to take the initiative in any measure, thought that it would be more prudent to avoid irritating the Emperor, and sug-

⁴⁰ Correspondance de Napoléon I., t. XXII., No. 17,822. D'Haussonville, t. IV., pp. 220, 410. Welschinger, p. 215.

⁴¹ They were the Archbishops of Ravenna, Turin and Tours, the Bishops of Nantes, Troyes, Ghent and Montpellier.

gested that the matter should be deferred until they took up the question of canonical institution. His advice was accepted, but on the demand of Cardinal Caselli the unanimous assent given to the proposal by the council was inserted in the minutes.

A long discussion then took place with regard to a passage in the address which declared that the censures of the Church pronounced on account of temporal matters were *ipso facto* null and void, an allusion to the bull of excommunication. But the decrees of the Council of Trent on the subject were produced by Mgr. Incontri, Bishop of Volterra; Cardinal Spina showed what disturbances might be created in Italy by again drawing the attention of the people to the matter, and the passage was suppressed. On the following day the Italian Bishops protested against the insertion into the address of Gallican propositions, and demanded that it should merely consist of a declaration of loyalty and devotion to the sovereign. The Bishop of Nantes, indeed, stated that the Emperor wished to have the address as it was, but the council ended by voting it in its much revised and corrected version, and decided that it should be signed only by the president and the secretaries.⁴² It was, however, after all these changes, so much at variance with Napoleon's ideas that he no longer cared to receive it, and the audience at which the Bishops were to have presented it was countermanded.

The committee named by the council for the discussion of the Emperor's message met on July 1. Its chief object was to seek for a mode of conferring canonical institution on the Bishops without the intervention of the Pope, and the Emperor gave them only eight days for that purpose.⁴³ The majority of the committee held the opinion that a deputation should first be sent to Savona to ask the Pope to confirm the concessions which he had already made to the three Bishops. On the other hand, the Emperor's partisans, the Archbishop of Tours and the Bishops of Nantes and Trèves, demanded a decision which should not irritate the Emperor and maintained that the Emperor insisted that the council should pass a decree before it obtained permission to send a deputation to the Pope. The Bishop of Nantes then read two requests which the Emperor had charged him to make to the committee, the answer to which was to be sent to him before it was communicated to the council: Firstly, does the committee think that the council is competent to

⁴² Rinieri, t. II., p. 192. D'Haussonville, t. IV., pp. 283, 448.

⁴³ The committee was composed of Cardinal Spina, Archbishop of Genoa; Cardinal Caselli, Archbishop of Parma; de Barral, Archbishop of Tours; d'Avian, Archbishop of Bordeaux; Hirn, Bishop of Tournay; de Broglie, Bishop of Ghent; de Boulogne, Bishop of Troyes; Duvoisin, Bishop of Nantes; Mannay, Bishop of Trèves; Grimaldi, Bishop of Ivrea, and Boari, Bishop of Comachio. Its president was Cardinal Fesch. Rinieri, t. II., p. 197.

decide, in reply to the Emperor's message, with regard to the canonical institution of the Bishops without the intervention of the Pope, now that the Concordat has been abolished? Secondly, the Emperor wishes the council to ask him to reestablish the Concordat, inserting a clause which should henceforth prevent any arbitrary refusal on the part of the Pope, and the Emperor is willing to agree to it. He will then allow a deputation of Cardinals and Bishops to be sent to bring to the Pope the decree of the council. If the Pope should accept it, all would be ended to the Emperor's satisfaction; if he should refuse, the right of giving canonical institution to the Bishops provisionally, and until the decision of an ecumenical council, would devolve on the metropolitans, in virtue of the decree of the council.⁴⁴

After three days' discussion the first demand was rejected by eight votes to three; the second demand, which was nearly the same as the first, but under another form, was rejected by eight votes to four, for on this occasion Cardinal Fesch voted also. The Cardinal then drew up a reply to the Emperor, stating that in the opinion of the committee, and in order to conform to what had always been the custom of the Church, the council before deciding the questions submitted to it should ask His Majesty's permission to send a deputation to the Pope to represent to him the deplorable condition of the churches of the French Empire and of the Kingdom of Italy and to confer with him as to the mode of remedying it. When, on that evening (5th July), Cardinal Fesch brought this reply to the Emperor and informed him that the majority of the committee had decided against the competence of the council to change the discipline of the Church with regard to the confirmation of Bishops, Napoleon gave way to a fit of fury, and during four hours poured out a torrent of invectives and threats against the council, repeating that he would bring the Bishops to reason; that he would dismiss the council; that he would consult his lawyers and declare himself competent. The Prefects should name the parish priests, the chapters and the Bishops. If the metropolitans should refuse to confirm them, he would close the seminaries and religion would have no more ministers. As for the Italian Bishops, he would confiscate their properties. Cardinal Fesch then replied: "If you wish to make martyrs, begin by your own family. I am ready to give my life for my faith." He added that he would never confirm any of his suffragans, and would excommunicate whichever of them should confirm a Bishop of his province.

This scene was interrupted by an interview given to the Bishop of Nantes, after which the Emperor said to Cardinal Fesch: "You

⁴⁴ Rinieri, t. II., p. 198. D'Haussonville, t. IV., p. 455. Diary of Mgr. de Broglie, Bishop of Ghent. Welschinger, p. 232.

are all fools! You do not understand your position. You do not know how to take advantage of it. I will extricate you from your difficulty, and will settle everything." Then, calling a secretary, he made him write down the points on which the committee should found its report. They were: 1st. That the Emperor's right to nominate to vacant sees would be annulled if confirmation could be refused for other reasons than those provided for by the Concordat of Leo X. 2d. That, as canonical institution was repeatedly refused, the Emperor could consider that the Concordat no longer existed and convoke a council to provide for the canonical institution of Bishops. 3d. That the deputation of Bishops sent to the Pope had been promised institution for the vacant sees, and that the Pope had approved the clause by which, if he or his successors did not grant institution within six months, the metropolitan should grant it.⁴⁵ The Emperor had thus obtained what he wanted, and the council was therefore asked to adopt the following decree and present it to the Emperor, requesting him to publish it as a law of the State.

The decree ran thus: "The council decrees: 1st. That sees cannot remain vacant for more than a year, within which time the nomination, the institution and the consecration must take place. 2d. The Emperor shall nominate to all vacant sees according to the Concordats. 3d. Six months after the nomination, at the furthest, the Pope shall grant canonical institution. 4th. After the expiration of six months the metropolitan, or in the case of the nomination of the metropolitan, the senior Bishop, shall have the power, in virtue of the concession made by the Pope, and shall proceed to institute and to consecrate. 5th. The present decree shall be submitted to the approbation of the Emperor to be published as a law of the State. 6th. The council shall request His Majesty to allow a deputation of Bishops to visit the Pope to thank him for having put an end to the sufferings of the Church by this concession."⁴⁶

By this dishonest trick of representing as a positive concession what was only meant as a plan for future discussion, which the Pope had refused to sign, and a part of which he had already rejected, the opposition of the committee was broken down. With the exception of Mgr. d'Avian, Archbishop of Bordeaux, and Mgr. de Broglie, Bishop of Ghent, who still insisted on first consulting the Holy Father, the others accepted the decree. Within a few hours, however, most of the Bishops saw that they had been deceived, and

⁴⁵ The Emperor must have known that this assertion was false. Rinier, II., p. 203.

⁴⁶ D'Haussonville, t. IV., p. 328. Correspondance de Napoléon I., t. XXII., No. 17,893. Note pour le Comité des Évêques. Saint Cloud, 6 Juillet, 1811. Rinier, t. II., p. 202.

when the committee met on the following day Cardinal Fesch very honorably consented to annul what had taken place, so as to allow the members perfect freedom of discussion. A large majority then declared that before such a decree could be voted or be made a law it was necessary to have the consent of the Pope in writing.

When Napoleon was informed of this decision by Cardinal Fesch he showed no outward signs of anger, though he announced his intention of closing the council; he allowed it, indeed, to hold another meeting, but he insisted that everything should be settled by July 14. The report of the committee to the council was then drawn up by Mgr. Hirn, Bishop of Tournai, and was presented at the general congregation, which was held on July 10. It declared that the council was not competent to pronounce a decision with regard to the confirmation of Bishops without the intervention of the Pope, even in cases of necessity, and that it should have the consent of the Pope, duly authenticated, before it could approve the decree which the Emperor had sent it. The council was then adjourned until July 12. That night Napoleon learned from the Minister of Worship that his decree had not been accepted. He showed great irritation and ordered the council to be dismissed at once. Mgr. Hirn, Bishop of Tournai; de Broglie, Bishop of Ghent, and de Boulogne, Bishop of Troyes, were arrested at three o'clock on the morning of the 12th and imprisoned in the fortress of Vincennes, for they were looked upon as having been most responsible for the opposition offered to the decree. Their arrestation excited a general feeling of indignation, but the newspapers were forbidden to make any allusion to it, and the Duke de Rovigo, Minister of Police, caused a report to be spread that it had nothing to do with the affairs of the council, but that the three prelates had been intriguing with Cardinal di Pietro in order to establish Vicars Apostolic in the vacant sees.⁴⁷

The Emperor's hope of persuading the Bishops assembled in council to accept his ideas had been disappointed; he therefore adopted another plan. The Ministers of Worship for France and Italy, Count Bigot de Préameneu and Count Bovara, were ordered to interview the Bishops of their respective States, one by one, and to obtain by every means in their power—flattery, threats, promises, cunning—that they should sign a document by which they accepted the Emperor's decree. The plan succeeded. The terror inspired by the fate of the three Bishops who had most resisted the Emperor's wishes, the description of the misfortunes to which their refusal would expose the Church and the advantages which they could secure by their compliance gradually overcame the resistance of the

⁴⁷ D'Haussonville, t. IV., p. 350.

majority of the prelates. On July 20 the Minister of Worship was able to inform the Emperor that he had already obtained fifty-three signatures and that others had been promised, and by July 26 eighty Archbishops and Bishops had accepted the decree. Many of them, indeed, signed only on condition that the Pope would grant his consent.⁴⁸

At a meeting of eighty-three prelates held on July 27 at the house of the Minister of Worship another document was presented for their signature. It contained two propositions as to which their opinion was demanded: 1st. The National Council is competent to decide with regard to the institution of Bishops in case of necessity. 2d. If a deputation of six Bishops is sent to the Pope, and if His Holiness refuses to confirm the decree proposed by the council, the council shall declare that there is necessity. The first of these two propositions was signed by most of the prelates, but very few consented to put their signature to the second. Napoleon thus felt assured that the council would now be favorable to his plans. He therefore authorized it to meet again by a decree dated August 3, which also named Cardinal Fesch as president.

When the council met on August 5 the Archbishop of Tours read his official report of the negotiations which had taken place with the Holy Father at Savona. It was the first time that a detailed account was presented to the Bishops, and Napoleon had taken care to suppress in it whatever displeased him.⁴⁹ The first only of the two propositions relating to the competency of the council was then brought forward and adopted by seventy-three votes to thirteen. This was followed by the presentation of the Emperor's decree under a slightly modified form; for it did not ask that it should be submitted to the Emperor's approbation and be published as a law, but that it should be presented to the Holy Father by a deputation of six Bishops, who should ask him to confirm it. The decree was not discussed, and only thirteen Bishops voted against it, protesting along with Mgr. d'Avian, Archbishop of Bordeaux, that the council was thoroughly incompetent to decide with regard to the institution of Bishops. Those who voted for the decree seem to have been satisfied by their demand for the approbation of the Holy Father that they were not guilty of insubordination. With this meeting the council of 1811 came to an end.⁵⁰

To form the deputation which was to present to the Pope the decree voted by the council Napoleon selected four of those Car-

⁴⁸ Welschinger, pp. 262, 268.

⁴⁹ Lecestre, t. II., No. 838. Au Comte Bigot de Préameneu. 21 Juillet, 1811. Je vous renvoie le rapport de l'Archévêque de Tours, où j'ai effacé des choses qui m'ont paru inconvenantes.

⁵⁰ Rinieri, t. II., p. 225. Welschinger, pp. 231, 387.

dinals who had merited his favor by their assistance at his marriage and at the baptism of his son, the "King of Rome." To these he added six Bishops and a little later three others.⁵¹ In order that the Cardinals might seem to have undertaken this mission of their own accord, the Minister of Worship persuaded them to ask the Emperor's permission to go to Savona to assist the Holy Father with their advice and request him to approve the decree of the council. In the instructions which Napoleon gave the Cardinals and the Bishops on August 17, he stated that with the sole exception of the Bishopric of Rome the decree comprised all the sees of the Empire, of the Kingdom of Italy and of all the countries which had been or should be united to France. The Pope was to be asked to accept the decree without modification or reservation, and he was not to republish in his own name, under the form of a bull or of a constitution, what the council had decided. If the Pope refused to comply, he was to be informed that the right to confer canonical institution had devolved upon the metropolitan without the intervention of the Pope, as was the custom before the Concordat between Leo X. and Francis I.⁵²

Though Napoleon was determined to bring the Church as completely under his control as he had brought all the rest of his vast Empire, he did not wish to run the risk of creating a schism which might replunge France into a civil war. It was with this idea that the council had been forced to accept a decree which aimed at carrying out his views, and the Pope, whose resistance was the only obstacle that stood in his way, was now to be persuaded by every influence that could be brought to bear upon him to ratify the decision of the council. For that purpose Mgr. Bertazzoli, Archbishop *in partibus* of Edessa, who had been one of the chaplains of Pius VII. and in whom the Pope had great confidence, was sent to Savona, as well as Cardinal Giuseppe Doria, who was then in Savoy. The Cardinals and the Bishops were assembled at Savona by September 3. The Holy Father appears to have been kept in absolute ignorance of the deliberations of the council, and it is not even certain that the deputation revealed to him the opposition which so

⁵¹ The Cardinals were Ruffo, Dugnani, Roverella, de Bajane and a little later Doria. The Bishops were de Barral, Archbishop of Tours; de Pradt, Archbishop-elect of Malines; Bonsignori, the Patriarch of Venice; Duvoisin, Bishop of Nantes; de Beaumont, Bishop of Piacenza, and Caranzoni, Bishop of Feltre, to whom were afterwards added d'Allégre, Bishop of Pavia; Mannay, Bishop of Trèves, and Bourlier, Bishop of Evreux. Rinieri, t. II., p. 228.

⁵² Correspondance de Napoléon I., t. XXII., No. 18,043. Au Comte Bigot de Préameneu, Ministre des Cultes. Saint Cloud, 17 Aôut. Rinieri, t. II., p. 239. Extract from the diary of Mgr. Gazzola, Bishop of Cervia. D'Haussonville, t. V., p. 6.

many prelates had offered to the decree and in consequence of which three had been imprisoned at Vincennes. Cardinal de Bayane and Mgr. Bertalozzi were the first to have an audience of the Holy Father, on which occasion Mgr. Bertalozzi wept abundantly, which, as M. de Chabrol remarked, was perhaps the most efficacious mode of influencing the Pope's mind. To Cardinals Dugnani and Ruffo the Holy Father pointed out that he could not come to a decision with regard to the acts of the council because he was not free. They mentioned the matter to M. de Chabrol, who assured them that the Pope might be free if he chose, but that he had always refused to go out when he had been asked. Was not his palace like that of any other Prince? Soldiers were posted round it, it is true, but not as a display of force, which was quite unnecessary under a strong government like that of the Emperor.

In spite, however, of the tears and supplications of Mgr. Bertalozzi and the arguments of the Cardinals and Bishops, whom the Pope received sometimes separately and sometimes together, the negotiations made but little progress; for the Holy Father wished to study thoroughly the documents presented to him, as he considered the matter to be of great importance for the welfare and the peace of the Church. The Bishops, and especially the Archbishop of Tours, seemed anxious to maintain the authority of the council and the dignity of the Emperor. They insisted, according to their instructions, that the decree should be simply accepted as it stood, but the Holy Father's objections and scruples were not easily satisfied or appeased. He was well aware that the deputation had come to persuade him to submit to the Emperor's will, for he told M. de Chabrol that the Cardinals who had been sent to him had, without doubt, been selected and predisposed (*prévenus et choisis*). To which the Prefect replied that they were his most ardent and enlightened friends.

The opinions of the Cardinals seem to have been favorable to the acceptance of the decree, and after several days of discussion the Pope at last consented to sanction it, not "purely and simply," as the Emperor had demanded, but by incorporating it in a brief, the draft of which was communicated to the Bishops on September 11. They suggested some slight modifications, and on September 20 they informed Cardinal Fesch that the decree had been approved. It is probable that Pius VII. was induced to make this concession by the suggestions contained in a memorandum drawn up by Cardinal Spina. In this document the Cardinal warned the Holy Father of the imminent danger of a schism, against which he should be on his guard. The council, it is true, ought to have consulted him before voting the decree, but he could now make it regular by

addressing to the prelates assembled in Paris an apostolic brief, in which he should consider the decree as merely the draft of a decree and thank the Bishops for not having come to any definite conclusion before consulting him. He might then declare that if, for unforeseen reasons, he did not grant canonical institution after a delay of six months, not caused by the unworthiness of the nominee, the metropolitans would be authorized to give it in his name to the suffragans, and the senior suffragan of the province to the metropolitan.⁵³ In consequence of this advice the Holy Father inserted in his brief the five articles of the decree, which, as he remarked, represented what he had already granted, and he declared that he confirmed them in order to avert with the help of God and as much as it was in his power the great misfortunes which threatened the Church.⁵⁴

Pius VII. had, indeed, made a great concession, but it was with the object of warding off the dangers which menaced the Church, and in spite of the efforts of the Cardinals and Bishops he had not submitted to the Emperor's demand that the decree should be simply accepted as it stood. He had guarded the rights of the Holy See by declaring in a clause of the brief which referred to the fourth article that whenever, after a delay of six months, institution was granted by the metropolitan or the senior Bishop of the province it should be "in our name or in that of the Sovereign Pontiff then reigning." He had also changed the last words of the fifth article so as to assert his claims to the Papal territory; for, instead of "the churches of the French Empire and of the Kingdom of Italy," which would have extended the decree to the Papal States recently annexed to the Empire, he substituted "the churches of France and Italy."⁵⁵ At the same time Pius VII. wrote to the Emperor assuring him that he trembled at the thought of the strict account which he should one day have to render of the way in which he had exercised his apostolic ministry. He reminded the Emperor that the Lord had given him the sword to defend and sustain the Church, and he implored of God to grant him His light, His assistance and His blessings.

Napoleon, who was already making preparations for his Russian

⁵³ Rinieri, t. II., p. 243. This document was found among Cardinal Spina's papers, and had not been previously published.

⁵⁴ D'Haussonville, t. V., p. 397. Rinieri, t. II., p. 250. The brief was addressed "Episcopis Parisiis simul congregatis," and not "in Concilio congregatis," as the delegated Bishops would have wished.

⁵⁵ Rinieri, t. II., pp. 242, 247. Welschinger, p. 305. For the words, "aux maux des Églises de l'Empire Français et du Royaume d'Italie," in the fifth article of the decree, were substituted, "aux maux des Églises de France et d'Italie." The Roman States had been annexed to the French Empire, not to France.

campaign, was then visiting the seaports of Holland. He deferred the consideration of the brief until his return to Paris, and ordered the Minister of Worship not to mention that it had been received, but to inform the members of the council that there seemed to be no doubt as to the issue of the affair, and that they might return to their dioceses. By this method, he remarked, he got rid of the council and was free to act according to circumstances.⁵⁶ A further development of his plans was announced in a letter from Rotterdam on October 26 to his Minister of Worship. The two decrees of the council were to be published as laws, but the brief was to be sent back to the Pope in order to have the objectionable passages eliminated, and the Pope would have to submit. Before the Pope was made aware of this difficulty he should be made to grant canonical institution for all the vacant sees. He would then find that the decrees had become a law of the State, and that the Bishops having received institution, he would not be able to obtain any settlement of his affairs until he had approved the decree. The greatest secrecy was to be observed with regard to this question; neither Cardinal Fesch nor the Bishops of the deputation were to be informed.⁵⁷

In a previous letter Napoleon had ordered the Bishops at Savona to send him a report proving that they had informed the Pope that the decree of the council was not to be extended to all the sees of the Empire of which the Roman States form part. On applying to the Holy Father they found that he had been fully aware of the Emperor's intentions when he accepted the decree, but that he had hoped that, by means of some clause or arrangement that he would suggest, the Emperor would allow him to nominate to the bishoprics of the Roman States; for to give up these nominations would seem to imply the renunciation of the sovereignty of Rome, which was forbidden him by his oath. This new pretension on the part of Napoleon subjected Pius VII. to a fresh persecution, but to all the arguments of the Bishops and of M. de Chabrol he had only one answer—that he had not enough of advisers; that he required to be free and assisted by his entire council, and that if he made any further concessions he would be dishonored in the eyes of all Catholicity.⁵⁸

On November 7 the Bishops addressed a long memorandum to

⁵⁶ Lecestre, t. II., No. 875. M. Daru à M. Bigot de Préameneu. Flessingue, 28 Septembre.

⁵⁷ Lecestre, t. II., No. 890. Au Comte Bigot de Préameneu. Rotterdam, 26 Octobre, 1811.

⁵⁸ D'Haussonville, t. V., p. 430. L'Archévêque de Tours au Ministre des Cultes, 18 Octobre, 1811. *Id.*, p. 444. L'Archévêque de Tours au Ministre des Cultes, 8 Novembre, 1811.

the Holy Father, in which they employed both arguments and threats to induce him to yield to the Emperor's pretensions, and pointed out to him the necessity of an immediate decision, for everything belonging to the churches of the Empire and of the Kingdom of Italy was absolutely in the power of the Emperor, who by "withdrawing his protection could reduce them to a more wretched state than that of the Irish Catholics." If His Holiness refused to come to terms, the Concordats would be considered as having ceased to exist, and in all the churches under the Emperor's rule canonical institution would be conferred by the metropolitan; all the other Catholic States would follow that example, and the Holy See would lose everywhere and forever its glorious prerogative of confirming Bishops. In order, however, that there should be no doubt about the matter, the Emperor wished them to declare positively to the Pope that his brief should not be accepted unless it extended to all bishoprics, even to those of the Roman States.

But the Holy Father saw clearly that by granting this demand he would ratify the Emperor's usurpation of the Papal States and would annul the sentence of excommunication which had been pronounced against him, and he refused to yield with regard to such an important matter. He dictated, therefore, to the five Cardinals on November 17 a reply which, as Cardinal de Bayane hastened to assure the Minister of Worship, was not in accordance with their views, for they had done all in their power to obtain that the brief should be extended to all the sees. In this note the Holy Father stated that by the brief of September 20 he had granted all that had been asked of him in the five articles of the decree which were based on what he had promised to the first deputation—namely, that he would confirm the Emperor's nominees according to the forms agreed upon in the Concordats of France and Italy, and that he would be willing to extend the same measures to the churches of Tuscany, Parma and Piacenza. As for the Emperor's intention of extending the brief to the Roman States, of which he had been informed by some Cardinals, he thought that His Majesty might perhaps have changed his mind, for the Bishops had not mentioned it to him. Though this extension would not comprise the See of Rome and the election of the Sovereign Pontiff, it would comprise the six suburbicarian dioceses to which the Pope does not nominate, but which are conferred by the choice of the Cardinals themselves according to their seniority. His Holiness, moreover, was much afraid of scandalizing the faithful, who might believe that he made these concessions to purchase his liberty, and he again asked to be assisted by a sufficient number of his experienced and learned counsellors in order that, guided by their advice, he might seek, with the

help of the Lord, the way to settle everything in a satisfactory manner.⁵⁹

Napoleon then ordered M. Bigot de Préameneu to inform the prelates at Savona that the Papal brief had been examined by a committee of Ministers and Councillors of State, who had unanimously decided that it could not be accepted because it was hostile to the authority of the Emperor, as it did not recognize the assembly of Bishops in Paris as a council; it gave the Church of Rome titles to which the government could not assent, and it required that canonical institution should be given in the name of the Pope. The majority of the committee had then advised that the council should be again convoked, or that the Bishops-elect should be instituted by a metropolitan synod until a general council should have decided the question. The Emperor, however, by way of a compromise, ordered some changes to be made in the brief, so that if the Pope consented to adopt them the brief could be accepted. Under these circumstances the Emperor declined to discuss questions of ecclesiastical discipline, but would wait until the decree of the council should be accepted before he could believe that a first step had been taken towards a reconciliation.⁶⁰

The Bishops begged in vain of the Holy Father to reconsider his brief, but he objected that that would only give rise to fresh demands, and he added that nothing could be decided with regard to the Papal States without another Concordat. He would not even discuss the matter with the Cardinals, but remarked that it was a serious affair and required to be carefully considered. To Dr. Porta, who still acted as de Chabrol's spy, he said that he was totally absorbed by the demands presented to him, and that thinking of them was turning his hair white. During several weeks the Holy Father was subjected to this persecution. The Cardinals, the Bishops, Mgr. Bertalozzi and M. de Chabrol succeeded each other without intermission, imploring of him to make the concessions asked by the Emperor, but without being able to make him yield.

On January 7 the Bishops presented to the Holy Father an *ultimatum* on the part of the Emperor and informed him in His Majesty's name that if they were recalled from Savona without having obtained any result, the right of instituting Bishops granted to the Pope by the Concordat would be abolished, and that the

⁵⁹ D'Haussonville, t. V., p. 458. Note des Cardinaux en réponse à celle remise par les évêques députés. Savone, 17 Novembre, 1811. The suburban sees are Ostia and Velletri, Porto and Sta Ruffina, Frascati or Tusculum, Palestrina, Sabina, Albano. (Gaetano Moroni, Dizionario di Erudizione Storico-Ecclesiastico, t. XCV., pp. 204, 224.)

⁶⁰ D'Haussonville, t. V., p. 472. Le Ministre des Cultes aux évêques députés à Savone, 3 Décembre.

Bishops nominated by His Majesty would receive institution from the provincial synod or from the metropolitan. M. de Chabrol even adopted an insolent tone in his interviews with the Holy Father. He told him that he was alone in his opposition to his council, to the Bishops and to the opinion of all the faithful; that his refusal was gradually destroying the interest which his partisans took in him, and he warned him that he should blame no one but himself for whatever might happen to him. But to all these attacks the Pope gave the same unvarying reply—that he would come to no decision until he was set free and was assisted by a more numerous council; for his honor demanded that such an important concession should not seem to have been the result of constraint.⁶¹

The Pope repeated the same statement in a second letter to the Emperor on January 24. He assured him that he did not refuse to make a further extension of the brief, but that he wished to have a larger number of advisers and to be allowed freedom of communication with the faithful in order to negotiate for the welfare of the Church with prudence and deliberation, so as to calm his conscience and avoid the scandal which might be caused if he were to act otherwise. When the Holy Father had sent this letter he declined to discuss the question again with the Cardinals or the Bishops, or even with Mgr. Bertalozzi; his health, he said, had suffered in consequence of his anxiety, and as he had come to a decision on the subject, he refused to hear any more about it until he had received an answer from the government.

The answer came on February 2 from the Minister of Worship. It was an order to the deputation to return to Paris, since their mission had failed, and then "everything at Savona was to be restored to its former condition." The Holy Father showed much emotion when the Bishops took leave of him, but his resolution was not to be shaken, and he expressed his confidence that Providence would intervene and settle the affairs of the Church. After their departure and that of the Cardinals everything in the Papal palace was placed in the same state as before, and precautions were taken to render all communication with the outer world impossible.

Napoleon did not reply directly to the Holy Father, but ordered the Minister of Worship to write to the deputation of Bishops a letter filled with the most unjust reproaches and false accusations against him. It bears witness to his deeply wounded pride and to the indignation which he felt at the unexpected resistance he had met with.

⁶¹ D'Haussonville, t. V., p. 487. Note remise à Sa Sainteté par les évêques députés à Savone, 7 Janvier, 1812. *Id.*, p. 489. L'Archévéque de Tours au Ministre des Cultes. Savone, 13 Janvier. *Id.*, p. 491, De Chabrol au Ministre des Cultes. Savone, 16 Janvier, 1812.

The Pope was accused of having preferred the opinions of Cardinals Pacca and di Pietro, whom the Emperor had been obliged to degrade as enemies of the State, to the advice of a hundred Bishops whose dioceses comprised three-quarters of Christendom. . . . “The Pope asks for free intercourse with the faithful; but how has he lost it? By not observing the duties of his ministry of peace and charity. He cursed the Emperor and the civil authority by a bull of excommunication, of which the original was found in Rome. . . . The condescension of the Emperor had left the Pope at Savona free to communicate with the faithful, but he had sent briefs to excite opposition in the chapters—briefs which were as remarkable for their ignorance of the canons as for their malevolence. . . . He has stirred up a spirit of resistance in the Roman States and caused those who obeyed him to be exiled; how could the Emperor allow free communication to be held with him? . . . The only councillors whom he wants are the ‘black Cardinals,’ whom he shall never have. If he thinks that he can decide nothing without them, and therefore loses forever the right of confirming Bishops, it is his fault.” The Bishops were then ordered to obtain within three days a simple consent to the decree which should comprise all the sees except that of Rome or leave Savona. The Emperor will then look upon the Concordats as abrogated and will not allow the Pope to interfere in the confirmation of Bishops. This diffuse and arrogant letter concluded by an insolent demand that the Holy Father should resign. “Why does he not abdicate and acknowledge himself incapable of distinguishing between what belongs to dogma and to the essence of religion and what is temporal and variable? If the Pope does not understand a distinction simple enough to be understood by any seminarist, why should he not voluntarily leave the Papal Chair to let it be occupied by a man stronger by his brain and his principles, who may at last repair the misfortunes he has caused in Germany and in all the other countries of Christendom?”⁶²

As the Cardinals and Bishops had already left Savona, it was M. de Chabrol who undertook to read to the Holy Father this lying and contemptuous document, and in his letter to the Minister he states that he read the strongest passages twice over to him. He also carefully noted the effect which they produced, and if the Pope made no remark he looked upon his silence as an acknowledgment of guilt. But neither then nor at any subsequent interview could de Chabrol by his arguments or his threats obtain any concessions. The Holy

⁶² Lecestre, t. II., No. 921. Lettre dictée par l’Empereur au Ministre des Cultes pour les évêques députés à Savone. Paris, 9 Fevrier, 1812. D’Haussonville, t. V., p. 503.

Father positively refused to publish another brief, and said that his conscience would not allow him to grant what was demanded of him, and that God would intervene to settle his affairs. Finding, therefore, all attempts to conquer the Holy Father's resistance hopeless, de Chabrol announced to him, by the Minister's orders, on February 23, that, as the brief dated September 20 had not been ratified, the Emperor would consider the Concordats as abrogated and would no longer allow the Pope to intervene in the canonical institution of Bishops.⁶³

For some months Pius VII. was allowed to live in peace in his prison at Savona, completely isolated from the world and apparently forgotten by Napoleon, who, surrounded by a brilliant court of German Princes at Dresden, was fully absorbed by the immense preparations which he was making for his Russian campaign. Shortly, however, before the war broke out he sent orders to Prince Borghese, Governor of Piedmont, to transfer the Pope from Savona to Fontainebleau, giving as a reason for this sudden resolution that he had just heard that there were English vessels before Savona, and that it was necessary to provide for his safety. The Pope was not to wear his Pontifical robes, but to be dressed as a priest; he was to stop only at Mont Cenis and to pass through Turin, Chambery and Lyons at night. The utmost secrecy was to be observed.⁶⁴ On the afternoon of June 9 M. de Chabrol and Captain Lagorse, an officer of *gendarmes*, who was to serve as escort, informed the Holy Father that he was to leave that night, and began to prepare him for the journey. They cut the crosses off his white shoes and blackened them with ink, so that he had to put them on while still wet. They took away his pectoral cross and gave him a black hat and a gray overcoat. About midnight they led him through Savona on foot and placed him in a carriage. Dr. Porta and Captain Lagorse accompanied him and Ilario Palmieri, one of his servants, preceded him in another carriage. The rest of the household was ordered not to mention the Pope's departure, and for several days, in order to conceal it, the candles were lighted on the altar where he said Mass and his table was served as if he were still present.⁶⁵

⁶³ D'Haussonville, t. V., p. 521. De Chabrol au Ministre des Cultes. Savone, 23 Février.

⁶⁴ Correspondance de Napoléon I., t. XXIII., No. 18,710. Au Prince Borghese. Dresde, 21 Mai, 1812.

⁶⁵ The account of Pius VII's journey from Savona to Fontainebleau is from a manuscript in the British Museum (Additional MS. 8,390, folio 19), of which M. d'Haussonville first made use. It is unsigned, but is evidently by some person in the Papal service. Also from a letter (Additional MS., 8,389) from Surgeon Claraz, of Termignon, in Savoy, dated 15 Septembre, 1814, to "M. l'avocat Luigi Cereghelli, Secrétaire de la maison du St. Père, à Rome. Account of the journey from Savona to Fontainebleau in June, 1812."

The infirmities of the Holy Father, aggravated by the rapidity with which he had been made to travel, caused him such suffering that when he arrived at the Monastery of Mount Cenis he seemed to be about to die. Captain Lagorse was much embarrassed; he was anxious to hasten on his way, but he feared the responsibility which he would incur should the Pope die while in his charge. A surgeon was sent for from a neighboring village and warned that it might cost him his liberty or perhaps his life if he revealed the fact of the Pope's presence. With his help the Holy Father was sufficiently restored to health, after a rest of three days, to be able to continue his journey, lying on a bed fitted up in his carriage. As by that time his identity had become known, crowds of peasants assembled at every village to express to him their sympathy and their veneration, but Lagorse took care to pass through the large cities at night and at full speed, although the jolting over the rough pavement caused the Holy Father intense pain. On arriving at Fontainebleau, about noon on June 19, it was found that the porter of the castle had not received instructions to prepare for the arrival of the Holy Father, and did not, therefore, dare to admit him, but could only give him hospitality in a neighboring house until, late at night, orders came from the Ministers to throw open the palace. A few months of repose then ensued for the Holy Father, which were followed, on the Emperor's return from his disastrous Russian campaign, by another attempt to extort further concessions.

DONAT SAMPSON.

London, England.

A MARQUISE OF THE OLD REGIME.¹

THE history of the French Revolution, with its horrors and its pathos, its heroisms and its tragedies, is irresistibly fascinating, and among its many sided aspects the story of the "émigration" is one of the most interesting. Not, indeed, that we can admire the light-hearted "insouciance" with which, as early as 1790, many French nobles left their country, ostensibly with the object of defending their King by raising an army on foreign soil. By uniting their forces to the enemy *without*, they exasperated the opponents of the throne *within*, and thereby increased the difficulties that encompassed their sovereign. As a political move their exodus was undoubtedly a mistake.

¹ La Marquise de Lage de Volude, d'après des documents inédits par la Ctesse de Reinach Foussemagne. Perrin, Paris.

Among the thousands of *émigrés* who for more than twenty years wandered over Europe many were, no doubt, provokingly foolish and frivolous, full of childish delusions and completely out of touch with the tremendous changes that were being wrought in the social world. Their chief charm lay in the bright courage with which they smilingly faced poverty, and the woman whose biography we lay before our readers is a good sample of an *émigré* lady of rank, with the virtues and the faults of her class.

The Marquise de Lage de Volude was a typical eighteenth century "grande dame." She had the brilliancy and grace, the sociability and ready wit, the frivolity and high courage of her race; her blind devotion to the Bourbons was often illogical, but always touching in its whole heartedness, and as time touched her with its mellowing hand and sorrow with its chastening rod, a graver element reveals itself in her character, bestowing extra dignity without any loss of charm.

Her life was closely bound up with that of the most famous personages of those dramatic times, and her story is interesting, not only because of her attractive personality, but also from her connection with the great political upheaval, the effects of which still control the destinies of modern France. Beatrix Stephanie de Renart d'Amblimont was born in 1764. Her father, the Marquis d'Amblimont, was a distinguished naval officer, but more refined and amiable was his wife, Marie Anne de Chaumont Quirtry, between whom and her daughter there existed strong mutual love and confidence. Indeed, her mother seems to have held in our heroine's affections a higher place than either husband or children.

The little girl, her parents' only surviving child, was educated at the Abbey of Panthémont, in the Rue de Grenelle. The convent chapel is now a Protestant church; the convent itself is a barrack, hemmed in on all sides by busy streets and tall houses. The shady paths where Mdlle. d'Amblimont and her young friends played have long since been swept away. The revolutionary tempest was to scatter far and wide the happy girls whose existence in the "*ancien régime*" convent was peaceful and refined rather than austere. Many bright heads were to fall beneath the knife of the guillotine; others were to grow white in the monotony of exile or live among the fearful risks entailed by life in France during the Reign of Terror.

One of Beatrix Stephanie's favorite companions was a girl from the south, Louise d'Esparbes de Lussan, a gentle and timid creature, whose childish grace appealed to Mdlle. d'Amblimont's stronger nature. The two remained fast friends in the future. Louise became the wife of the Cte. de Pölastron and subsequently the

mistress of the Cte. d'Artois, the King's youngest brother, but her equivocal position does not seem to have shocked her friend's principles. Our *émigré* lady's blind loyalty towards her "dear Princess" somewhat obscured her views of right and wrong.

When she left Panthémont our heroine was taken up by the Princess de Lamballe.² She was a childless widow and resided either at court or with her father-in-law, the Duke de Penthièvre.³ Beatrix Stephanie henceforth shared her life. In some of her letters that have happily been preserved Melle. d'Amblimont draws charming pictures of the household of which she now formed a part. The Duc de Penthièvre, one of the wealthiest noblemen in France, was as generous as he was rich; moreover, in a skeptical age, he was a devout Catholic. On his way to church he often found his young daughter-in-law and her companion reading novels. "When you are older," he used to say with a smile, "you will read more serious books, 'il faut que jeunesse se passe.'" The only child and heiress of this kindly old man was the wife of the notorious Philippe Egalité, Duke of Orleans.

The Princess was much attached to the witty and impulsive girl who brought an element of brightness into her widowed life, and it was she who arranged the marriage of Mlle. d'Amblimont to the Marquis de Lage de Volude, a naval officer of good family. He was a kind-hearted, easy-going man, subservient in all things to his brilliant wife. "I might have led him like a child," she wrote fifty years later.

The wedding took place on January 16, 1782, in the chapel of the Palace of "l'Arsenal," where the bride's mother had an apartment. Few among the foreign visitors to Paris have the curiosity to visit this ancient dwelling place of the Valois Kings. Its exquisite "boiseries," with their dainty grace, carry us back to the day when Beatrix Stephanie's bridal draperies swept along the polished floors. It is pathetic to note how many of those who were present at the ceremony or who signed the wedding contract died a tragic death. Mgr. de la Rochefoucauld, who gave the nuptial blessing, was massacred at the "Carmes" in September, 1792; the King, the Queen and Princess Elisabeth perished on the scaffold. Worse was the fate of the bride's second mother, Madame de Lamballe, hacked to pieces in the streets of Paris ten years later.

The young Marquise as a married woman was now qualified to take part in the social gayeties of the court. The years that imme-

² Marie Thérèse Louise de Savoie Carignan, married to the Prince de Lamballe, cousin to the King, 1749-1792.

³ Louis de Bourbon, Duc de Penthièvre, son of the Comte de Toulouse, himself a natural son of Louis XIV. 1725-1793.

dately preceded the Revolution seem to have had a peculiar attraction. Talleyrand enlarges upon "la douceur de vivre" of that brilliant and most fascinating epoch. To us there is a strange charm in the contrast between the refined elegance and careless wit of the day and the terrific tragedy that looms in the background. Over the powdered heads hovers the knife, and the tiny feet, so eager in the pursuit of pleasure, soon grew weary of treading the high roads and byways of exile.

The upper classes of society, barring a few exceptions, were serenely unconscious of the perils ahead. They knew little and cared still less about the spirit of discontent that was growing up among the people and which many complex causes helped to develop. The vices and reckless expenditure of Louis XV., the weakness of his well meaning successor, the evil teaching of the free thinking philosophers, all these abuses combined to prepare the most complete upheaval of modern times.

To realize the danger that lay under the brilliant surface of society it needed thought and observation, and our heroine had time for neither; nor was she, as she candidly owns, in touch with the lower orders, whose existence she ignored. In her own world, however, she soon made her mark by her liveliness and gayety, her wit and good humor, and with a light heart she plunged into a vortex of dissipation. She was no beauty, but very captivating, and she soon became a general favorite. Her intimates were the Duchesse de Palignae, the Queen's favorite; her daughter, the Duchesse de Guiche, and the Comtesse de Polastron, her convent friend. Among the Royal Princes she was most devoted to the King's youngest brother, the Comte d'Artois, afterwards Charles X.

In many of her judgments of public persons and events Madame de Lage shows much good sense, but her blind worship of the frivolous and dissipated young Prince, whose follies discredited his brother's cause, cannot be defended. He remained her idol to the end. If not always reasonable, she has at least the merit of faithfulness. More than half a century later we shall find her speaking of the aged Charles X. with the same loving devotion as she spoke in her youth of the scatter-brained Comte d'Artois.

One of the pet vices of the day was gambling, and to this failing our heroine cheerfully pleads guilty. She was an assiduous visitor of Lady Kerry,⁴ an Englishwoman of wealth, at whose house in Paris high play was the order of the day. Supper parties at "la Muette," Versailles, Rambouillet and other royal residences filled up much of her time, together with more childish diversions, such

⁴ Anne Daly, married first to Charles, Earl of Galway; secondly to Harry, Viscount Kingsland; thirdly to Francis Fitzmaurice, Earl of Kerry.

as donkey rides in the park of Versailles in company of the little Duchess de Guiche, *née* Aglaé de Polignac, whose infantine notes were carefully preserved by her friend to her dying day.

At this period of her life the Marquise de Lage's warmest affections seem to have gone out, not to her husband, whose career kept him at sea and who when present passed unnoticed, but to her mother, the Marquise d'Amblimont, to whom she wrote constantly. She possessed the essentially French gift of spontaneousness and grace, with the airy charm that gives life and color to the smallest details, and as we peruse her letters visions of the court of Versailles pass before us—the Queen, beautiful and dignified, who was slowly realizing that the nation's adoration for its sovereigns was a thing of the past; the King, with his apathy and ungainly manners, which irritated our Marquise's energetic nature and offended her taste; the Princess Elizabeth, who, says Madame de Lage, "is a perfection of perfections, full of noble and generous feeling and whose timidity changes into firmness when she strives to enlighten the King." The somewhat quixotic enthusiasm with which a portion of the French nobility hailed what was regarded as the advent of a golden age of universal brotherhood rouses our heroine's sarcasms. In her usual downright fashion she condemns the liberal views of M. de la Fayette, M. de Noailles and other young noblemen who had served in the American War of Independence, and she makes no secret of her aversion for Necker, Mirabeau and the Duke of Orleans. She belonged to the old *régime* by her convictions as well as by her birth, and had no patience with those of her friends who were inclined to adopt the new-fashioned theories that were then afoot. One letter to her mother relates an amusing discussion between Madame de Lage and the Duchess de Luynes. The latter seems to have expressed a certain sympathy for the leaders of the popular party, while the former admitted that the rebellious chiefs of the "Fronde" and the "Ligue," being *grands seigneurs*, deserved consideration, but to be led by the people, "My Duchess, does not this horrify you!"

On May 4, 1789, the States General of the kingdom assembled at Versailles. Our Marquise was present at the gorgeous pageant that heralded the approach of the revolution. She noticed the sadness of the Queen, who was wrung with anxiety for her eldest boy. The little Prince, an immensely prococious child, lay hopelessly ill at Meudon. He died a month later, leaving a "heritage of woe" to his younger brother, the unfortunate Louis XVII. During the same month of June the first symptoms of insubordination appeared among the Deputies, and the insolent attitude of the "Tiers," or bourgeois party, foreboded graver evils to come. On July 14 the Bastille was taken by the mob. Thereupon Madame de Lage and two of her

friends, Madame de Polastron and Madame de Poulpry, fled in undignified haste across the frontier.

Our Marquise, as events will prove, was a brave woman, who more than once steadily faced death. In this case she acted like a frightened child, and we are tempted to wonder if this hasty rush to a new country was not partly suggested by the passion for traveling, which, unlike most of her countrywomen, she possessed in an extraordinary degree. The three ladies (M. de Lage only joined them later) met with some adventures on the way. They were insulted and threatened by the people, and, worse still, at Belfort they were mistaken for Madame de Staël, M. Necker's famous daughter, a fact that our Marquise bitterly resented, for Madame de Staël, so brilliantly clever, was also hopelessly plain. "The mistake was bound to cease when we showed our faces," writes Madame de Lage, "for we three and our maid were tolerably good looking."

At Bâle the fugitives found the Duchess de Polignac and her party, and when once the danger was past they laughed at each other's frightened faces. This first taste of exile had no bitterness about it; it was a comedy rather than a tragedy, and soon our *émigrés* seem to have realized the foolishness of their position, for Madame de Lage decided to return to France. It was characteristic of her to choose the longest route. From Bâle she and her husband made their way to Berne, Lausanne, Geneva, then across France, by Lyons, Clermont and Limoges to Tirac, M. de Lage's "château" near Saintes. Here, in February, 1790, her third and youngest daughter, Calixte, was born. She already had two little girls, but they filled an insignificant place in her life and seem to have been cared for by the Marquise d'Amblimont. It was not till some years later that our Marquise awoke to a sense of their claims upon her. She cannot pose as an attentive mother, and it is one of the curious traits of her complex nature that, in her old age, she became as affectionate a parent as she was an indifferent one in her youth. When she had recovered her strength Madame de Lage started for Paris with her husband and father-in-law. On the way they visited their Breton relations, and at St. Brieuc "some silly peasants," writes our heroine, "mistook us for the new Constitutional Bishop and his suite. My father-in-law amused himself by giving them his blessing, and some of them were stupid enough to kneel down to receive it, although my presence and that of my maid made up an escort that was scarcely canonical."

On arriving in Paris in the spring of 1793 the Marquise took up her position in the household of Madame de Lamballe, who assured her that things were less "terrible" than she imagined, and for the next three months life seemed to resume its even course. In reality,

matters were becoming tragical. The King was a prisoner within his own palace, a sovereign only in name, and after much hesitation he determined to break his bonds, and our readers know how the ill-managed attempt failed miserably and how the royal family was brought back to closer captivity.

The Princess de Lamballe and her lady-in-waiting spent the fateful night of the King's escape at Lady Kerry's, where, as usual, they gambled and, our heroine confesses, "lost all their money." Somewhat crestfallen, they returned to sleep at Passy, then an outlying village, where the Princess had a country house, little thinking that a cumbersome vehicle containing the royal family was even then making its way beyond the suburbs of Paris along the country roads eastwards. At daybreak a note from the Queen informed Madame de Lamballe of her flight. The Princess, much perturbed, awoke our Marquise, and the two women began their preparations for departure. These were of the simplest description, and this second exodus, like the first, has a touch of comedy. Madame de Lamballe took her diamonds and Madame de Lage two "chemises" and a few pocket handkerchiefs. Money they had none, having lost all their ready cash the previous night. A few hours later a traveling carriage left Passy. In it were packed the Princess and her ladies, Madame de Lage and Madame de Ginestous, their two husbands, Madame de Ginestous' little girl, and on the box next to the coachman, a servant fully armed.

The travelers passed the barriers of Paris with some difficulty, and towards evening, hungry and frightened, they arrived at Aumale, where the Duc de Penthievre was living with his daughter, the Duchess of Orleans, whose husband was notorious for his partisanship of the revolutionary party. The fugitives were warmly welcomed, but Madame de Lamballe was anxious to hurry on; she consented, however, to sit down to a meal, which Madame de Lage confesses was a welcome boon. The Duchess gave the ladies clothes and money, the Duke's servants filled the carriage with eatables, and thus equipped the travelers started for Boulogne, where they embarked for Dover in a small boat. On landing in England they heard of the King's arrest at Varennes. However, Madame de Lamballe decided to go on to Belgium, and on July 11 she and her party arrived at Aix la Chapelle, where large numbers of their countrymen had already assembled. Most of these belonged to the serious minded class of *émigrés*, who realized the deadly meaning of the revolutionary crisis and who foresaw its tragic developments.

Our young Marquise soon found her surroundings somewhat austere, and, the Princess de Lamballe having reluctantly given her leave of absence, she started for Coblenz, where a very different

atmosphere prevailed. Here the King's brothers held a mimic court. Two distinct classes of men surrounded them. The most estimable, if not the most enlightened, were the gentlemen who formed the nucleus of the royalist army, of which the Prince de Condé was the organizer and the chief. There was a pathetic element in the composition of these unconventional troops, where gray-haired "châtelaines" from remote provinces fought by the side of true-hearted and impetuous lads, who were children in years. The same spirit inspired both—a heart whole devotion to what they believed their duty as servants of the King, together with many optimistic delusions as to the real strength of the hated republicans. Then among the immediate surroundings of the Princes were the frivolous and mischievous intriguers, who helped to discredit the cause they professed to serve, men bent on pleasure, however grave might be the perils ahead. In this particular set the Comte d'Artois was master of the revels, and his favorite, Madame de Polastron, was enthroned as Queen.

Madame de Lage's letters to her mother describe the entertainments that filled up the days and nights of the Comte d'Artois' friends. The price of everything was high, but "one must dress, and 'chiffons' cost frightfully dear." To pay for her "toilettes" our Marquise sold a diamond necklace. Her favorite Prince excites her enthusiasm: "He is our hope, the grandson of Henry IV. He has, say the old people, a look of Louis XIV. Each one of his words is treasured. . . . Bad news is forgotten and we feel encouraged when we look at him."

A gracious word, a noble gesture coming from their idol were enough in these early days to make the *émigrés* forget their own privations and dangers and also the anarchy that now reigned in France.

The gayeties of Coblenz seem strangely out of tune with the scenes of bloodshed that were taking place across the frontier. Gambling was the ruling passion of the exiles, as it had been that of the courtiers of Versailles in happier days. Our Marquise relates how one night after a supper given by the Comte de Provence the gay company decided, instead of going to bed, to adjourn to a country inn and to breakfast next morning "in the prettiest garden in the world." On arriving the men of the party, having ransacked the primitive hostelry, found a shabby table, on which they threw a cloak. They then brought candles, counters and cards, and the whole party "played till five in the morning. We were quite ruined," adds Madame de Lage, "but we laughed heartily."

In September our heroine returned to her post, but a month later Madame de Lamballe determined at all hazards to leave Aix la Chapelle and take up her duties as mistress of the Queen's house-

hold. This resolve was simply heroic. The Princess, a delicate and nervous woman, was physically unfit to face the dangers that even then surrounded her royal mistress. Of her two ladies in waiting she only took Madame de Ginestous with her to Paris, leaving Madame de Lage behind under the wing of Madame de Polastron.

However, eight months later, in July, 1792, the Marquise d'Amblimont became dangerously ill at Bordeaux, and our Marquise on hearing the news unhesitatingly decided to return to France, although, in consequence of the severe laws recently issued against the *émigrés*, she thereby risked her liberty and her life. Love for her mother was her strongest passion, and the perilous journey she now undertook proves the depth of her filial devotion. Her father and husband, both of whom had joined the royalist army, bade her farewell as to one who was facing certain death.

Traveling was no easy matter for a lady of rank in 1792. Madame de Lage left Coblenz on July 14, and after several narrow escapes, she reached Paris, where Madame de Lamballe begged her on no account to show herself at the Tuileries. The presence of an *émigré* from Coblenz was enough to compromise the royal family still further. The Princess herself, who one month later was brutally murdered in the streets of Paris, still believed that a favorable crisis might take place. "The King has so many friends," she urged. "This is true," shrewdly observed her friend, "but he will not allow them to act."

At last, after being repeatedly delayed by vexatious formalities and alarmed by hostile demonstrations, our traveler reached Bordeaux. At this point of her history she reveals a depth of feeling that is all the more precious because such expressions are rare under her pen. "I am not sentimental," she once owned. She walked to her mother's house in terror, not venturing to ask for news. When told that the invalid was still alive, "It seemed to me," she writes, "as if heaven was rewarding me for what I had suffered." Overcome by all she had endured, she sank down on the stairs, where her three little girls stood waiting for her.

Madame d'Amblimont, although better, was still in a critical condition. The two doctors who attended her were the one a fervent royalist, the other a rabid republican. "Messieurs," she used to say, "I hope you will come to a better understanding over my constitution than over the constitution of the State." Her daughter hardly left the sick room. One of her friends supplied her with newspapers, which she devoured in secret, and the news she gathered was full of horror. Her uncles, the Bishops of Beauvais and Sanites, the latter of whom had officiated at her marriage, were massacred in the prison "des Carmes" on September 2, and, worse

still, the friend of her youth, Madame de Lamballe, was done to death outside "La Force." Our readers know how the Princess' head was severed from her dead body and how, after her fair hair had been carefully curled and powdered, the ghastly trophy was paraded under the Queen's windows at the "Temple."

The Duchesse de Tourzel, governess to the royal children, was Madame de Lamballe's fellow-prisoner at "La Force," and in her memoirs—for she fortunately escaped death—she described the calmness, dignity and religious feeling with which the fragile and fanciful woman, whose "vapours" in her prosperous days had excited some ridicule, went to meet a hideous death.

In Madame de Lage likewise the unborn courage of her race and breeding comes to the surface at this crisis and outweighs the childish frivolity of other days. During the Reign of Terror the pleasure-loving Marquise of Coblenz reveals herself a brave, self-sacrificing woman.

These surprises meet us at every turn. They bring out in strong relief the characteristics of the eighteenth century French nobility. These men and women may be provokingly careless and curiously illogical. Their gay heroism is almost sublime, and after a hundred years their subtle charm entralls us still. Maybe that the very contrasts that puzzle our Anglo-Saxon thoroughness help to make this charm more irresistible.

From her mother's sick bed at Bordeaux Madame de Lage was called away in January to her father-in-law at Tirac. The old man gladly welcomed his son's wife, but one winter evening the friendly "maire" of a neighboring village secretly informed our Marquise that the "gendarmes" were on their way to arrest her. According to the revolutionary legislation she was liable as an *émigré* to be immediately executed. Her dying father-in-law had sufficient presence of mind to provide for her safety. He gave her all his ready money, put a light carriage and his best horses at her disposal and, having sent for his coachman: "My friend, save my daughter. It is the last and greatest service you can render me."

At Blaye, where she had to cross the ferry, the fugitive accidentally overheard that the King had been executed. At Bordeaux she was concealed in the house of a rich tradesman named Perrier, who allowed her to occupy a garret, her own mother's "hotel" being closely watched.

It is pleasant to note that in her dire distress our heroine met with humble friends who risked their lives to help her. One of these, a Savoyard named Maurice, undertook to conceal her money and her jewels and to carry her letters when, Bordeaux having become dangerous, she removed to a lonely farmhouse at some distance.

Madame de Lage's indomitable spirit served her in good stead at this crisis. She was absolutely alone, separated from all those whom she loved. Almost within sight of her hiding place the guillotine was in daily use. She owns that the isolation weighed upon her, and that when the honest Maurice appeared he seemed "a god." By degrees, however, her buoyant spirits returned. "I began," she says, "to get accustomed to my lodgings and to the kind of life I had to lead. I sent for my pencils and for some books, and I spent the day reading, drawing and writing."

But even this lonely farmhouse was not safe. One day Madame Perier, to whom it belonged, heard that it was to be searched. She came in person to warn her guest, and, to avoid notice, the two women returned to Bordeaux on foot. On the way they met a group of excited peasants and overheard the name Antoinette. "Oh, mon Dieu!" exclaimed Madame de Lage, "they are speaking of the Queen." Her companion put a question, and the answer confirmed their worst fears. Maria Antoinette had been executed on October 16, and when that evening the two royalist ladies entered Bordeaux they found the town brilliantly illuminated in honor of the event.

Thickly veiled, Madame de Lage ventured to creep into her mother's room. If discovered in the house her presence meant death for both. For once our heroine's nerves got the better of her. "I was so weak and tired that I fell on my knees by her side," she says. "I kissed her hands and our tears fell fast. We remained, I believe, for more than an hour without speaking. I was sitting at her feet, my head resting on her knees."

The news that Madame d'Amblimont gave her daughter was scarcely fitted to soothe her overstrained mind. All their friends were either beheaded or in prison, and the house was so closely watched that only by the merest chance did our *émigré* lady escape detection.

Her next hiding place was the apartment of a midwife, Madame Coutanceau, but in order to justify her presence under this good woman's roof the fugitive had to pretend that she would ere long require her services. With the help of some towels she altered her figure so as to produce the desired effect, and we seem to see her humorous smile as she adopted this ingenious disguise. But, as it was impossible that she could play her part for an indefinite period, Madame Coutanceau decided to appeal on her behalf to the future Madame Tallien, who was at that time living with Tallien, the despot of Bordeaux, over whom she possessed unbounded influence.

The career of this extraordinary woman is one of the most curious episodes of an epoch when truth is often stranger than fiction.

Terezia de Cabarruy was a Spaniard, the divorced wife of a French nobleman, the Marquis de Foutenay. By right divine of her matchless beauty she reigned over the hearts of men, and Tallien, the regicide, the rival of Robespierre, after saving her from death on the guillotine, promoted her to share his dictatorship at Bordeaux. In the symbolic pageants which were then the fashion this strangely assorted pair paraded the streets in a triumphal car, the beautiful Spaniard in vaporous garments resting her tiny hand on the shoulder of the man who held at his mercy the lives of thousands.

Be it said to her credit, the "citoyenne" Tallien was of a kindly disposition, and many "aristocrats" owed their safety to her good offices. She became interested in Madame de Lage and asked to see her. To her new friend Terezia spoke openly of the difficulties of her position. She owned that she did not care for Tallien, but by protecting her he had compromised himself in the eyes of his party, and she felt bound in honor to stand by him. "She had more courage and kindness than good sense," adds our Marquise. The two women exchanged locks of hair. "My hair for its beauty and its length was quite unique," says our heroine, and Terezia's "the prettiest that I ever saw in another style, like black silk."⁵

In possession of a passport where she was described as an American, Madame de Lage returned to the house of her humble friend, where her figure resumed its natural proportions. She dared not visit her mother, but on her way to the boat she passed under the window at which Madame d'Amblimont stood in tears. The faithful Maurice saw her off. "Do not come back; you have given us too much trouble," said the honest fellow, who had over and over again risked his life in her service.

Madame de Lage left Bordeaux on February 27, 1794, and after a rough passage landed in Spain, where she imagined that both she and her family would find peace and protection under a Bourbon King, but her expectations seemed to have been disappointed, and she eventually made her way to England, where she found herself, not knowing a word of English, stranded alone in a low class London inn. She managed, however, to make her presence known to her friends, and many "habitués" of her Paris "salon" gathered round the forlorn traveler.

Matters had assumed a different aspect since the days of Coblenz, and most of the French exiles who congregated in London were now, in spite of the generosity of the British Government, reduced to dire distress. These light-hearted noblemen and delicate women worked for their bread and displayed much dignity and courage

⁵ Madame de Fontenay afterward divorced Tallien and married, as her third husband, the Prince de Chimay, of an illustrious Belgian family.

under adverse circumstances. Their inborn gayety was unquenched, and it adds an undoubted charm to their brave struggle against poverty.

The Marquise de Lage had a young brother-in-law, the Vicomte de Volude, who is a typical example of the folly and high-mindedness that combined to make the *émigrés* at once provoking and delightful. He was a brilliant, handsome, charming spendthrift, whose extravagance had often irritated his father, so merry and witty that he kept Madame de Lage and her friends in fits of laughter half through the night, thereby scandalizing the staid lodging house keeper, who remonstrated with her pensioners on their ill-timed mirth. This careless young fellow had, to all appearances, nothing of a martyr in his composition, yet his death was heroic. Like many of the refugees in England, he enlisted in the royalist army that, owing to the mismanagement of its chiefs, fell into the hands of the republicans at Quiberon, in Brittany. The promise given by the republican General Hoche that the prisoners should be spared was put aside and orders were sent from Paris to execute them one and all. Young de Volude's boyish face struck the republican soldiers. "Do not tell us your real age," they whispered; "say you are younger, and you will be saved." The youth turned to his uncle, M. de Kergariou, and his eyes asked a question. "Better die than lie," answered the stern old Breton, and a few minutes later uncle and nephew fell in the wide field by the river side still called the "Champ des Martyrs."

In June, 1797, after three years' stay in London, Madame de Lage decided to return to Spain. She was still haunted by the idea that the Spanish Bourbons might help her, and this time her hopes seemed to have some foundation. Her father, the Marquis d'Amblimont, after fighting in the *émigré* army had taken service in the Spanish navy. He had just died a soldier's death at the battle of Cape St. Vincent, a fact that gave his family some claim on the gratitude of the Spanish Government. Acting on this idea, the Marquise de Lage, who was idle since the disbanding of the *émigré* army, hastened to Madrid to negotiate for a grant of land near Porto Rico. His wife started to join him, but although the Reign of Terror was at an end, stringent laws still prevented the *émigrés* from entering French territory, and our heroine's attempt to evade the prohibition proved a failure. She went from London to Hamburg, where she had an interview with the republican Minister Reinhard, to whom she endeavored to prove that she had never emigrated. Her uncle's stern creed, "Better die than lie," did not appeal to her, and her fantastic account of her proceedings does credit to her imagination. The wily republican was not deceived. "He merely

smiled and bowed his head at all I said that was not true," owns our heroine, to whom leave to travel through France was eventually refused.

Nothing daunted, she pursued her way leisurely through Switzerland and northern Italy, stopping to visit the French *émigrés* at Schaffonse, Constance, Bale, Lucerne, Lugano, Milan, Turin and Genoa. She crossed the St. Gothard Pass in December and spent, she says, "five days on horseback on a road of ice, under the snow and rain." This delicately nurtured Marquise had nerves of iron, and her physical endurance equaled her spirit of enterprise. At Genoa she met Madame de Ginestous, who like herself had belonged to the Princess de Lamballe's household. The scenes she had witnessed in Paris in August, 1792, had given the unfortunate woman a shock from which she never recovered, and she trembled from head to foot when she related her terrible experiences to her old friend.

At last, after a crossing that lasted ten days, our traveler landed at Barcelona, whence she proceeded to Madrid, where her husband had just obtained from the Spanish Government a grant of land near Porto Rico. Soon after his wife's arrival he left for America, where he died a few months later.

Although he filled so insignificant a place in his wife's life and probably in her affections, Monsieur de Lage was not devoid of sound common sense, if we judge from a letter written in 1798, in which he strongly urges the Marquise to abstain from political intrigues, rightly pointing out that as an exile in a foreign country it behooved her to win sympathy rather than excite criticism by her vehement partisanship of her beloved Princes.

At this point of our heroine's story her children appear upon the scene. Apart from its widespread political consequences, the Revolution of 1789 wrought untold havoc in the private lives of thousands. It snapped or loosened family ties that were never formed again; it inflicted wounds that never healed; it created breaches that were never bridged over, and many children whose little lives were shaken by the terrific tempest bore to their dying day the marks of the ordeal through which they had passed.

Of the Marquise de Lage's three children—Natalie, born in 1782; Stephanie, in 1787, and Calixte, in 1790—the eldest was taken charge of by Madame Senart, a friend of her family's, who, when the Reign of Terror was at its worst, fled with the child to New York. The two younger, Stephanie and Calixte, now joined their mother at Madrid.

Judging from a delightful miniature in possession of Madame de Lage's descendants, the three girls were unusually pretty. Their

childish figures have a dainty grace that is irresistibly fascinating, and their mother, whom first her court life, then her exile abroad and adventures at home, had separated from her daughters, awoke somewhat late to a sense of their charms. Her letters from Madrid have a true ring of pain, when Clixte, the youngest, died in 1800. "If you only knew," she writes to Madame de Polastron, "how she understood and felt everything. . . . What a child I have lost! She was too perfect to live, too serious, too sensitive and loving." And again: "I can neither work, read nor draw. . . . I spend my days in a state of prostration such as I never felt before. . . . Something within me is broken." But Madame de Lage's nature was too buoyant for any sorrow, however keenly felt, to cast a lasting shadow over her. Her second daughter, Stephanie, absorbed much of her attention. "She is a little love," writes our heroine to Madame de Polastron; "you would love her to distraction." And she goes on to relate how, reared among the tragic surroundings of the Revolution, Stephanie had early learnt lessons of self-possession. On one occasion, when she was asleep, the friends with whom she was living burst into her room, made her get up and, having concealed a hunted "Vendéen" under her mattress, told her to lie down again and feign sleep. The stratagem saved the man's life. These experiences delighted Madame de Lage. "You have no idea," she writes, "of all that Stephanie knows about la Vendée. . . . I could hardly believe my ears when I heard this little parrot talking of these things."

Although she had many friends at Madrid, the chief of whom was the Comtesse de Montijo, to whose family belonged the Empress Eugénie, Madame de Lage as time went on felt a growing desire to see her country and her mother again. The star of the victorious General Bonaparte was now in the ascendant, and however much she hated the "Corsican ogre," she could, owing to his absolute government, return to France without risking her head.

She began her homeward journey in September, 1800. The roads were unsafe, and she joined other travelers bound for the frontier—a stout French lady, "who believed that the eyes of all France were fixed on her return," and two priests, who hailed from Cadiz, where the plague was raging, a fact that made our Marquise look askance on the two abbés.

On arriving at Bayonne she was delighted to be once more among her own people, but thunderstruck at their optimistic illusions, when they naively assured her that "Bonaparte was about to offer the crown to the Duke d'Angouleme⁶ and to his wife."

⁶ Son of the Comte d'Artois, afterwards Charles X., married Marie Thérèse, the only daughter of Louis XVI.

She visited her mother, who had left Bordeaux for the quiet provincial town of Saintes, and then hurried to Paris to receive her daughter Natalie, who was returning from New York. Delighted with the girl's charming appearance and manners, she began, with her usual impetuosity, to form projects for Natalie's marriage with the noble scion of some royalist family. But the girl had grown up among other surroundings, and she gently, but firmly, informed her mother that she was engaged to marry Thomas Sumter, a young American diplomat, whom she had met on board the ship that brought her home. He was a wealthy, well connected, honorable and high-minded man, deeply attached to Natalie, and was no unworthy partner for the penniless girl, whose parents had been completely ruined by the Revolution. But to Madame de Lage, a woman of the old *régime*, the announcement came as a blow. She could not understand that her daughter should decline to fall in with the ideas and customs that she herself held dear, and it is amusing to note how her old friends thought it necessary to "condole" with her on what was in reality an excellent match.

The Marquise d'Amblimont seems to have been less prejudiced, and when, after some delay, she gave her consent, she did so with a graciousness that must have won her new grandson's sympathy. Her letter breathes the subtle, refined, old-fashioned courtesy for which her contemporaries were famous, and she confesses that from all account M. Sumter seems "the most worthy, affectionate and loyal of men."

Madame de Lage ended by giving her consent, though less gracefully than her mother, and the wedding took place in Paris in March, 1802.

Our heroine's maternal feelings were subject to curious vicissitudes. After her marriage her American daughter seems for many years to have passed out of her life, but thirty years later she clung to her and to her children with strange tenacity. Natalie Sumter's grandchildren are now the only surviving descendants of the Marquise de Lage.

After her daughter's wedding a feeling of unrest seems to have taken possession of our Marquise. She was now free to settle down in her own country, but the charm of a wandering life still appealed to her, and when we consider the difficulties of traveling at that date and her very reduced circumstances, the way in which she flits from Edinburgh to Madrid is truly wonderful.

In Scotland she went to stay with the Comte d'Artois and her old friend, the Comtesse de Polastron. In Spain she put forward her claim to certain sums of money that were due to her father, who had been killed in the service of the Spanish Government. Then in

January, 1804, she rushed back to London, where Madame de Polastron was dying of consumption.

This journey took place in the depths of winter, and, accustomed as she was to rough it, our heroine confesses that she never endured such hardships. She traveled safely enough from Paris to Antwerp, but between Antwerp and Rotterdam, "Nothing," she writes, "can give an idea of what I suffered. . . . The people of the country could not imagine how a woman ventured to travel at such a season." Between Rotterdam and Gravesend, to which port she was bound, a storm arose and drove the ship into Yarmouth. At last, on January 22, Madame de Lage stood by the deathbed of the woman whom she had first known as an innocent child in the cloisters of Panthémont. "From that moment," she writes, "I never left her house and seldom her room."

Madame de Polastron's deathbed repentance was the outcome of the religious convictions that since her convent days had slumbered, but had never been extinguished. She was to the last gentle, loving, timid, unselfish, incapable of exercising an invigorating influence over the Prince, to whom her life had been devoted. Her sins were the result of weakness rather than of vice, and her contrition was touchingly expressed as she lay with her hand tightly clasped in that of her friend.

After her death the Marquise de Lage lingered on in England. Then we find her in the south of France, at Bagnères, and finally at Saintes, where she remained for about a year. The old spirit of unrest again took possession of her, and she went to Spain to visit the Duchess of Orleans, widow of Philippe Egalité and daughter of the kindly Duc de Penthiévre, under whose roof she had spent her youth. The two had many memories in common. "The Duchess is a relic of the family and of the society in which I was brought up," writes our traveler.

With marvelous elasticity the exiles had made themselves tolerably happy in an obscure Spanish town. As the sole heiress of the Duc de Penthièvre the Duchess of Orleans was at one time the wealthiest woman in France. She was now reduced to poverty, but she and the members of her little court devoted much time to conversation, that supreme pleasure of the eighteenth century men and women, in whose hands it became a fine art. With her varied experiences and sparkling "verve," Madame de Lage proved a welcome addition to the narrow circle.

In 1808, however, she returned to Saintes, where this time she remained for nearly five years. The marriage of her daughter Stephanie took place during this period, but, as in the case of Natalie, Madame de Lage's ambitions were doomed to disappointment. Since

Stephanie had returned with her to France she had, it must be owned, troubled herself very little about the girl. Small wonder, then, that she found her "cold and undemonstrative." She was, however, anxious that "Fanie" should make a good match, and different grandes of Spain are alluded to in her letters as possible sons-in-law. In order to give her friends a favorable impression of Stephanie's sentiments and style, she persuaded her mother to compose some charming epistles, which, as she cheerfully confesses, she read aloud to the people whom she wished to impress. She is delighted at the cleverness with which the old lady "adopted the style of a young person who is tender, amiable, perfectly well educated, but simple and even childish, with much natural grace and delicious 'naivete.'" But neither these ingenious devices nor the care with which she refrained from scolding Stephanie lest she should cry and spoil her complexion, brought about the desired result. Instead of a grande of Spain, Mdlle. de Lage married, probably for her greater happiness, M. de l'Ile de Beauchaine, a country gentleman, who, if he was not a brilliant conversationalist, was a worthy and sensible man.

Madame de Lage herself owns some weeks after the wedding that "M. de l'Ile calls me 'maman' with all his heart, and I call him my son with all mine, for he seems a good young man." Her opposition to the match was suggested merely by vanity, for after acknowledging that her son-in-law, "if not the ideal that I wished for, is a good man," she adds, "but as far as this world goes, he and a laborer are to me much the same"—"Un laboureur et lui, c'est tout un."

In spite of her cleverness our heroine could not bring herself to accept the practical results of the Revolution that had changed the old order of things. She remained to the end of her life a woman of the "old régime." A touching episode of Madame de Lage's residence at Saintes is the visit she paid to Tirac, her husband's property, that had passed into other hands. She had not been there since the January night when she fled for her life from her father-in-law's deathbed, and the reception that she met with went to her heart. The peasants surrounded her, eager to make her welcome. They shed tears when they spoke of their former "seigneurs," whose kindness they remembered, and the penniless *émigré* lady was received with as much honor as though she still possessed the broad lands of Tirac.

Another old retainer sought her at Saintes, and his visit brought back vividly the occupations and interests of the past. "Madame," he said, "you remember Pacault? It is I, who when you had the measles used to read to you the Memoirs of Mademoiselle de Montpensier, I who copied out for you the passages that you marked for

me in the Memoirs of St. Simon. . . . I was in poverty; you helped me to live. . . . I remember the unhappy Princess de Lamballe, the Duchess of Orleans and her venerable father. . . . I remember the flowers that you wore and the perfumes that you used; perfumes always make me think of you." And, anxious to prove his affection for his former benefactress, the good man, who was now in the wine trade, presented her with a barrel of old brandy.

Very pathetic is the way in which the returned *émigrés* who congregated in the provincial towns strove, in spite of their poverty, to keep up a dignified appearance and bravely made the best of their narrow circumstances. Many, like Madame d'Amblimont and Madame de Lage, were living almost in sight of the "châteaux" and lands of which the Revolution had robbed them, but though their wealth had vanished their spirit was unbroken.

They proudly kept aloof from those whom the great upheaval had enriched and also from those who of their caste, from policy, adhered to the new order of things, and, steadfast in their faithful, if blind, devotion to the vanished past, they waited in dignified retirement till "the King should have his own again."

Now and then the buoyant spirit of their race prompted them to break the dull monotony of their lives by a *fête*. On one memorable occasion Madame de Lage acted as hostess. The entertainment began by a dinner party, followed at six o'clock by a dance, to which came "a cloud of young ladies chaperoned by respectable mothers. . . . Even the old people danced. . . . My mother was extremely gay and did not regret her thirty bottles of wine."

The extraordinary rise of the man whom she continued to call "Bonaparte" exasperated our Marquise, and when, in 1808, the Emperor and Empress passed through Saintes, she refused to lend her house to lodge them and to illuminate to do them honor. When requested to join a group of ladies who were to be received by the Empress, "I have long since renounced Satan and his pomps," was her reply.

Her indiscriminating love for the past often makes her unjust. Her son-in-law's personal supervision of his property is a grievance. "It is quite impossible," she complains, "to find among young men the politeness and delightful manners of old times. No wonder; they are all farmers and tradesmen."

In 1812 the Marquise d'Amblimont closed her long life at Saintes, and her daughter, eager to escape from the empty house, gladly accepted an invitation from her uncle, the Chevalier de Chaumont Quirry, to come and live with him at Orleans. The Chevalier was a charming specimen of an old soldier. He entered the army when only fourteen, and saw much hard fighting in the Royal Grenadiers.

Through the ups and downs of a chequered career, he kept the faith of a little child. "I am so sure of God's goodness," he used to say, "that I am no more afraid of dying than I am of passing from one room into another. It is not in vain that my Saviour died for me." Every Sunday the old soldier, half blind, very deaf and rheumatic, was present at High Mass at the Cathedral, cosily ensconced in a place among the canons, where he was safe from draughts. He gave his niece a loving welcome. "When I arrived he took me into the full light to examine me, turned me round and round to look at me. Tears of joy came into his eyes when he saw that my figure had not altered. He kissed me as if I had been a baby. When he noticed my complexion he grew sad. 'How is it that you have lost your pretty color?'" The old man's warm affection, his chivalrous courtesy and the cheerfulness with which he bore his infirmities delighted our Marquise. "I thank God for allowing me to keep my faculties," he used to say. "I can think of Him and realize all I owe Him. For many years I did not pay attention to these things." This devout spirit did not make him intolerant. He loved young people and was always indulgent towards their follies, remembering his own wild youth. His chief weakness was his propensity for telling long stories, and Madame de Lage humored this foible by listening day after day to a certain episode of his campaigns—the retreat of Prague. "As soon as we are alone, he says: 'Now I must tell you about the retreat of Prague.' . . . He is delighted when I ask him questions. Sometimes I fall asleep, but he is blind and does not notice it."

With her liveliness and wit, her varied experiences and love of conversation, Madame de Lage brought a new element and interest among the Chevalier's friends. These were the dean of the neighboring cathedral, a good conversationalist, accustomed to refined society, an old soldier, who had served in the *émigré* army and who wore his arm in a sling, and two Breton ladies, who boarded in a convent close by. Every evening these survivors of a *régime* past and dead discussed their hopes for the future, hopes that centred on the King's return, and watched with feverish anxiety the gradual downfall of Napoleon's power. When at last the crash came, the Marquise could no longer restrain her impatience. She made her way to Paris through a camp of Cossacks, "the most amiable men in the world," and with other royalist ladies, dressed in white and carrying lilies, she stood at the entrance of the Tuileries to welcome the daughter of Louis XVI. The Princess had not crossed the threshold of the palace since the 10th of August, 1792, when she followed her parents to the Temple. Of those who surrounded her on that fatal day, the King, the Queen, the Princess Elisabeth, the

Dauphin, the Princess of Lamballe had perished at the hands of the revolutionists. No wonder that the saddened woman, who twenty years later found herself among the once familiar surroundings, burst into a passion of tears.

The return of Napoleon on the 20th of March was a terrible shock to our Marquise. She immediately fled to Spain, and only in December, 1815, when her beloved Bourbons had taken the place of the "Corsican ogre," did she return to Paris, where, her means being limited, she settled down in a small apartment, Rue des Saussaies.

The restoration of Louis XVIII., to which she had looked forward as to the crowning joy of her life, did not bring Madame de Lage unmixed satisfaction. Her uncompromising temper rebelled at the concessions which the new King thought it necessary to make, and she was indignant when men like Talleyrand and Fouché became his counsellors, while those who, to use her words, "had only served honor and their King," were left out in the cold. She was no diplomat and unable to understand or to accept the ungracious necessities that, it must be owned, often wore the appearance of ingratitude.

On the other hand, her sociable temper and love of conversation were fully satisfied by the eagerness with which the friends who, like herself, had been wanderers over the face of Europe, now flocked to her little "salon," but their attentions seemed no longer to completely satisfy her. She began about this time to wish for a closer acquaintance with the numerous grandchildren who were growing up on the other side of the ocean and who, her second daughter having no children, were her only lineal descendants.

Mrs. Sumter, whose marriage had been so grievous a disappointment, now took an important place in her mother's affection, and to this long-forgotten daughter Madame de Lage wrote delightful letters, which are treasured to this day by her American grandchildren. In these letters our Marquise, who was essentially a woman of tradition, evidently sought to bridge over years of neglect and separation. She informed her daughter not only of present events, but of a thousand details and incidents concerning her family, anxious that her new world descendants should be fully acquainted with the past glories of the d'Amblimonts and of the de Lage de Volude. When Mrs. Sumter came to Paris, bringing her daughters, Natalie, Bresilia and Marie, the girls remained on a visit to their French grandmother. She seems to have been kind to them, though severe on the subject of "good manners." It was hardly likely that the sturdy young Americans should in every respect come up to the ideals of their "old régime" grandmother. They belonged to a different race and to a different epoch. "My dear," Madame de

Lage wrote to Mrs. Sumter, "I find that your daughters are too much at their ease with you. . . . For pity's sake, do not spoil Bresilia. . . . I send her back to you very gentle, submissive and respectful. . . . Let her remain so."

Bresilia Sumter became Mrs. Brownfield, and died in 1889 at Summerville, surrounded by memorials of her grandmother, to whom she was much attached. One of her sisters, Marie, died in Paris at the age of twenty-two, and another, Natalie, married a French diplomat, the Vicomte de Fontenay.

As years passed by Madame de Lage began to feel the isolation that old age brings in its train. One by one her friends died off and their loss was deeply lamented by one in whose life friendship had filled an important place, so important indeed that her family ties, save that binding her to her mother, appear somewhat sacrificed to "le culte de l'amitie."

This feeling of isolation was not without a beneficial effect on our Marquise's buoyant and restless nature. Suffering seems to have developed her religious convictions that long lay dormant; when sorrow and solitude laid their heavy hand upon her, her spiritual perceptions became keener, her views of life graver, and in her correspondence occur many sentences like the following: "My child, I have prayed a great deal these days."

The increasing unpopularity of Charles X., who, in 1824, had succeeded his brother, Louis XVIII., was an anxiety to our royalist lady; she loved her sovereign with a personal affection, and to her his accession had been a joy beyond words. She therefore noted with pain the symptoms of popular discontent that culminated in the revolution of 1830, a revolution that drove Charles X. into exile and changed the course of her own life.

She now declared that the soil of Paris "burnt her feet" and that she could not live under the government of the "infamous usurper," and in the spring of 1831 she emigrated to Baden, where she spent the last twelve years of her long life. Louis Philippe, be it said to his credit, continued to pay her the annuity which his mother had settled on her, in memory of the Princess de Lamballe.

At Baden the Marquise de Lage enjoyed a unique position. An introduction to her was eagerly sought for and her visitors were fascinated by the Old World atmosphere of her "salon" and by the attractive personality of its mistress.

She kept to the end her vivacity and brilliancy; she was as vehement in her likes and dislikes, as enthusiastic and sensitive, as imaginative and warm-hearted as she had been in her youth. Age had not dulled her perceptions nor diminished her interest in men and things, and her delight in conversation was as keen as ever. She sat,

among the memorials of a vanished past, an interesting and pathetic figure. Close at hand was a clock given to her by the Princess de Lamballe, an exquisite miniature of Marie Antoinette, painted in the heart of a rose, a watch that had belonged to Louis XIV., portraits of her long lost friends and many dainty "bibelots," to which were attached memories of her court life. She was always ready to conjure up the visions of her brilliant or tragic days. "Madame de Lage knows an infinite number of interesting things and speaks of them in an original way," says one of her visitors; "she feels with extraordinary keenness."

Twice during these later years our royalist lady went from Baden to Toeplitz to visit Charles X., who was taking the waters. The old King and his life-long admirer met on the familiar terms of other days; she dined and spent her evenings with his little court, treated by him as a confidential friend. The death of Charles X., in 1836, made her shed bitter tears. "Never was a Prince so tenderly served," she writes to her daughter. "The King's death has done for me. It is the loss of an affectionate interest! the breaking of a strong tie made up of a thousand sweet and sacred links—the respect for authority, the confidence of friendship and the charm of past memories. . . . If you knew how good he was to me!"

The aged royalist's passionate devotion to the Bourbons now transferred itself to the Duc de Bordeaux, the one hope of his ancient race. "I would gladly be killed for that child!" she exclaimed on her deathbed.

The Marquise de Lage died on December 7, 1842, one year after her daughter, Mrs. Sumter. Her end, we are told, was devout and peaceful.

In her will are reflected the affections that filled her heart during life. She desired to be buried in Vendée, among the royalists of that faithful province; her papers and "souvenirs" were left to her grandchildren or to her friends, each bequest being accompanied by explanatory comments that prove how precious to her were the memorials of those whom she had loved during life.

This faithfulness is one of the most attractive traits of Madame de Lage's character; she was no saint, merely a clever, impulsive, brave woman. The secret of her undoubted social triumphs lay in her spontaneous wit and vivacity, that contrasted with the artificial atmosphere in which she was bred. She was often one-sided and prejudiced in her judgments, capricious in her attitude towards her children, and occasionally unjust when even her best beloved ran counter to her wishes. But in circumstances of unusual difficulty and danger she showed a bright good humor and an endurance that are at once charming and estimable. At an epoch when political

apostasies suggested by self-interest were common she proved herself disinterested and faithful to her ideals, and even those to whom those ideals do not appeal cannot but appreciate the pathetic fidelity that never swerved from its allegiance.

BARBARA DE COURSON.

Paris, France.

GLIMPSES OF BRAZIL.

TO land in Bahia is to drop suddenly into another world. We had been nearly two weeks at sea, and cast anchor in the harbor after the record run of the steamer Verdi, of the Lampert & Holt Line. No other steamer is known ever to have made the voyage from New York in so short a time. We arrived a day before the scheduled time.

The voyage had been most pleasant. After the pitching on the long swells off the American coast, for the Verdi rolls little, we crossed the Tropic of Cancer to sail upon summer seas. Captain and officers did all they could to make life agreeable for the passengers, and the doctor, F. R. Warden, helped assiduously to keep up our health and spirits. The voyage resembled all other voyages to the southern hemisphere. There were sports, games and varied amusements to break the monotony; the ever vigilant Neptune paid us his customary visit as we crossed the Equator, and time sped away under happy circumstances. The North Star had long set to rise no more, and the Southern Cross was shining in the heavens when we neared the coast of South America. Closer and closer we approached to the shore, after passing Pernambuco in the distance, until we could see the houses and the trees on the land. Finally, on the afternoon of May 3, we entered the bay of Bahia. With the fiery sky of the tropics overhead and the blue-green waters beneath, our ship steamed on, while a splendid panorama opened before us. Parallel with our course rose the point of La Barra, beneath which a deserted battery and above which the large Church of San Antonio de la Barra drew our attention. Turning the point, we had the city before us, where churches innumerable raised their steeples to the sky. In fact, the most striking objects in Bahia are its churches.

The first thing done when our anchor had gone rattling down to the bottom was the reception of the officials. They came in two launches, the doctor and his staff in one and the police in another. These visits completed, we began to go ashore. A number of sail-

boats manned by Negroes were tossing about at the foot of the ladder, with the boatmen crying at the top of their voices for passengers. A quick and very satisfactory bargain, and I sat in my boat with a party of gentlemen, to be wafted ashore over the pleasant waters, past steamships and square-rigged vessels and through a crowd of small boats and lighters. Three-quarters of an hour passed and we stepped on land.

Unfortunately we had only a few hours to skim the surface of the city, and so the impressions came tumbling over each other into my mind.

The population of Bahia is about 300,000, the vast majority of which is colored. I am told that the Negro population amounts to eighty per cent. This was confirmed by experience, for there were Negroes and mulattoes in picturesque costumes everywhere, while those who seemed to be white might be counted on the fingers. Brazil was one of the great slave-holding countries in the world, and slavery existed there longer than anywhere else in the Western Hemisphere. It is only a few years since it was abolished.

Notwithstanding some modern improvements, such as electric cars, electric lights and elevators, Bahia, the third largest city in Brazil, has best preserved its old colonial character. Many of its churches bear an air of antiquity with the old Spanish Renaissance style dating back to the early colonial epoch. The streets are narrow, the houses massive, with a number of arched buildings. In spite of its squalid appearance, the city is said to be most healthy, and many of the inhabitants are long lived. It is divided into two parts, the upper and the lower town, the latter stretching out along the water front, with its landing places, its stores and its markets. Quaint old stone stairs lead upward, and these in days gone by must have been one of the means of reaching the upper town. To-day the spirit of the modern era has struck the city. Electric cars, built in Philadelphia, remind one of home. Two inclined railways scale the heights and two large elevators of Otis manufacture render the ascent easy. There is also a residential section of the city which time did not permit me to visit.

We were struck by the unobtrusive character of the people. There were no would-be guides, no impudent venders of curios. We were scarcely noticed or looked at, but when spoken to every one was most polite and affable. Some of the party did a little shopping, but though I had a general theoretical knowledge of Brazilian money, I grew confused when it became necessary to put it into practice, and the constant use of hundreds and thousands upset me. I paid fifteen hundred reis to go ashore. The sum sounds big, but it was only about forty-five cents. A postal card

costs one hundred reis, or between three and four cents, and so on. Bahia is the centre of the tobacco industry, besides a brisk trade in diamonds and in whale oil. Adjacent as it is to the whaling grounds, it sends out its whaleboats during the season to bring in the great monsters of the deep. A great deal of business is in the hands of Germans. There is also an English colony, but Americans are few.

Of course, the religious and moral condition of the place interested me. Had time permitted, I would have visited the churches and would have interviewed the priests. As it was, though there were churches all around me and the sweet sound of their evening bells fell upon my ears, I might visit one only—the Cathedral—to thank God for my safe journey over the seas. Bahia is the seat of an Archbishop, and his Cathedral, to which I will later devote my attention, deserves a visit. I did not meet a single priest in the streets, though churches were everywhere.

My object in my travels is Spanish, not Portuguese America, hence I cannot pose as a student either of its literature, its manners or its history. I can barely record my impressions and relate what I saw and heard. In the short time at my disposal I saw much and heard a little. Had I been one-sided or had Providence not arranged it thus that I might listen to both sides, I might have left the place with very wrong notions.

My first informant was one of the Negro boatmen, who spoke a little broken English, but with whom I managed to communicate in Spanish. He volunteered the information that there were three hundred churches in Bahia; that they were very rich, and the important occupation of the priests was to make money. One of my fellow passengers remarked that this burden did not appear to weigh very heavily on him.

We had with us Mr. Warner, the newly appointed Consul of the United States to Bahia, and as we went in quest of the Consulate, then in charge of the Vice Consul, I met with a young man, quite polite and affable, who pointed out the way and with whom I engaged in a somewhat prolonged conversation in French. He told me that he was a student. As the talk drifted to religious matters he expressed the opinion that Catholicity in Bahia was dead, and that the only religion in the place was atheism. He said that the number of churches was so great that some believed that there might be one for every day in the year. The priests, he added, were merely engaged in making money. Here, then, were two witnesses, a Negro boatman and a university student. They gave me a gloomy view of the situation, and had I heard none but them I would have gone away with an impression most unfavorable. I fear that some

travelers might have been content with this testimony, and that they would have drawn general conclusions from these *ex parte* witnesses to the extreme detriment of religion.

Now it so happened that several Brazilian passengers came on board our steamer at Bahia. I managed to strike up an acquaintance with one of them and obtained from him much information. There seemed to be no bias in his mind in favor of the Brazilian clergy; in fact, he even praised the Protestants at the expense of his own countrymen. Yet his testimony was directly opposed to that of the boatman and the student. He positively denied the assertion regarding the prevalence of atheism, and asserted that Catholicism universally prevailed, and that the churches were frequented. Of course, as everywhere else, there are unbelievers of all kinds, but Catholicism is the religion of the people, and the priests generally perform their duties well. Among them are a number of foreign clergymen.

I was also fortunate enough to obtain a copy of a Bahia newspaper, the *Jornal de Notícias*, through the kindness of Mr. Mueller, the Vice Consul. A careful study of this paper gave me a glimpse of the life of the people, social, political and religious.

As regards their religion there is no doubt that exercises of piety are indicative of the fact that it is not dead. I find that in many churches and institutions the exercises of the month of May are held, either at Mass in the morning or in the afternoon at different hours from two o'clock until six. Among the chapels and churches special mention is made of the private chapel of Senhor Joao Taveres da Silva, where the devotions of the month of Mary were inaugurated with great solemnity, and a well filled chapel with decorations of the altar and the glare of electric lights, ladies singing the hymns with harmonious accompaniment. The paper congratulates Senhor Taveres for thus honoring the Blessed Virgin. A few days before our arrival the Typographical Association of Bahia celebrated its thirty-ninth anniversary, the solemnities beginning with a Mass celebrated in the Church of San Pedro dos Clerigos, a band of the police regiment furnishing the music and playing the Brazilian air at the "Sanctus."

I find in the same paper two columns of names of residents of Bahia, by a rough calculation amounting to five hundred. They are all of men in different walks of life, political, social and commercial. The list is headed by a State Senator. These signatures are affixed to a petition addressed to an ecclesiastical superior, begging that the Father Vicar, Antonio Cyro do Valle, should not be transferred to another place, because he is necessary to their parish of "A Cruz das Almas é Sape" and because he is universally admired for his virtues

as a man and as a priest. Surely these five hundred signatures show that some interest in religion exists in Bahia and that priests are admired for their virtues. We learn also that the Society of the Apostolate of Prayer had forwarded a similar petition with 301 signatures.

That a certain amount of piety exists among the people, which, of course, our intelligent American visitors might designate as superstition, is shown by the stores of religious articles one meets. They are far from being artistic, these rude statuettes, but they speak volumes. Then, as you walk along the streets and hear the beggars imploring alms in the name of "Maria Imacolada," you are reminded that atheism has not succeeded in eradicating all sentiments of that Catholic poetry which our fathers knew and which the Middle Ages have bequeathed to us.

From what I can learn, an intellectual atmosphere once existed at Bahia, which appears to have somewhat decreased of late, though it still manifests itself by the discussions of learned societies and by public lectures. The question of cremation is now agitating the popular mind of the State of Bahia.

On the day I sailed from New York, April 20, an article appeared in the *Sun* concerning the views of Mr. William J. Bryan on "Missions" in South America expressed before the Board of Presbyterian Missions. The distinguished gentleman had just returned from a visit to South America, traveling in a direction opposite to the one I am following. Our good ship the *Verdi* had brought him up from Bahia to Barbados.

We know that for some years the Protestants have been carrying the war into Africa, and that among many countries they have been bringing the Gospel to the "benighted" peoples of South America. Thus far I have not come in touch with them, but by the time this article appears I shall most likely know more. Following the method I have prescribed to myself, I shall always draw the line between what I have heard and what I have seen.

I have heard that they are carrying on an active propaganda in Bahia among the lower white class, and to a small extent in the better class, by means of their Sunday sermons and Thursday conferences and by literature which they spread around. The missionaries, gentlemen as they are, make themselves respected by the natives, and though a few years ago Protestantism was unknown in Bahia, it has made a number of converts. I repeat that I have this merely on hearsay. However, I am of the opinion that it is a fallacy and a most dangerous error to rest on our oars and let matters take their course in the belief that Protestantism will never succeed in Latin countries. We cannot keep the faith in people merely by the ringing

of church bells and external observances. These may act upon the feelings, as Emilio Castelar was tenderly recalled to the memory of his early years by the sight of St. Peter's dome from the Monte Pincio, and as even a Byron was affected by the bells of the "Ave Maria" at "the hour of prayer." But the emotions pass. The people in all countries need instruction, for ignorance can never be proof against seduction. I am told that the clergy in Bahia give catechetical instructions, but to what extent I know not. I am sure they must have their hands full with the immense Negro population they have to cope with, the residuum of the slave trade, of which Bahia was at one time the centre.

I am now going to relate an incident that was of the greatest interest to me. Strange to say, nearly everywhere I have been—in Holland, Belgium, Germany, Spain and Italy—I have met with memories of the "old" Society of Jesus as it existed before the suppression. Surely that society has left its impress upon the world, and were it still extinct, it would be remembered by its monuments. I did not think on landing at Bahia that one of the first objects that would rivet my attention would be a monument of the Jesuits.

In our search for the American Consulate we passed through a large square, upon which stood an imposing edifice united to a church. I soon discovered that the building was that of the medical faculty. But the church? Above the main door of the façade stood a statue of St. Ignatius, and in the wall a slab dedicated to the seventeenth century Jesuit, Father Antonio Vieira, one of the classical writers of Brazil, whose centenary was celebrated at Bahia some time ago. Was this then the church of the Jesuits, and had they perhaps charge of the medical college? The front doors were closed, but I decided to investigate. Above the entrance to the part of the building immediately adjoining the church I read the inscription, "Colegio de S. Paulo." This, then, must be the Jesuit college, I concluded, and passed in through the open door expecting to see the Brother porter and to inquire of him where I might find the American Consulate. But all was as silent as the tomb. A long and deserted corridor stretched its gloomy perspective before me. Not a being was in sight; not a sound could I hear. A door on my left was ajar. I pushed it open and walked in, and the golden splendor of a magnificent church buried in solemn gloom burst upon me. In a far-off chapel flickered a feeble light. I dropped upon my knees to thank God for our safe journey. I had no time to investigate further, for my companions were outside, and I did not want to lose them. At a glance, however, I had noticed that the entrance to the pulpit was from the rear, reminding me of that of the Gesu, in Philadelphia. But was this, then, the church of the

Jesuits? My further inquiries resulted in the information that the church I had entered is now the cathedral, but that at one time it was the church of the society. A portion of the building of the present faculty of medicine was once their college. So here I stood in presence of the work of Pombal. As the memory of that gorgeous church remains engraved on my memory I cannot help thinking of the barbarous cruelties practiced by Pombal and Arauda on the men who at one time were the great educators of Latin America, and the illustrious names of whom will last forever in the history of its literature. Bahia possesses also an old Franciscan convent of the early colonial period, known especially for its artistic paintings on Dutch tiles. I had, unfortunately, no time to see it.

Darkness fell upon us at sunset with that suddenness so characteristic of the tropics, and when we had pushed off from the shore to return to our ocean home the Southern Cross was in the sky. The electric lights of Bahia fell back as those of the Verdi grew brighter. Indistinct lay the dark hulls of the vessels in the harbor. The rattling of the anchor chain of a French liner told us she was getting under way. Our Verdi blew her whistle to call us home, and in a few hours we were steaming on to Rio Janeiro.

Before reaching Bahia the coast of Brazil is visible for a day or more, but between that city and Rio de Janeiro and, in fact, until the vicinity of Montevideo is approached, very little of the coast is seen. The bay of Rio de Janeiro, with its mountains on all sides and its characteristic "Sugar Loaf," is famed as one of the finest harbors of the world. Of course, tastes differ. As to myself, I prefer the Bay of Naples. Yet there is no doubt of it, the Bay of Rio de Janeiro is beautiful. As we entered it in the early morning we were rejoiced by the sight of the American flag flying from our man-o'-war, the North Carolina. From Bahia to Santos we saw the English, French, German, Italian, Spanish, Dutch and Brazilian flags, but this was the only occasion we might greet on the seas that flag so dear that reminded of home and which years ago was seen in every port of the world. So small is our traffic with South America that while one may proceed via England, France, Holland, Germany, Spain or Italy, there are only two lines carrying passengers from the United States, the Lamport & Holt, the passenger service of which is of comparatively recent development, and the Lloyd Brazileiro, an unimportant Brazilian line. Our influence in South America amounts to little, though in Brazil more than anywhere on the east coast. English capital is everywhere operating railroads and other industries, while German commerce is prominent, but the United States remains in the background. I am told, however, that since the visit of Mr. Root a great change has taken place, and a Brazilian

newspaperman did not hesitate to assert to me that American capital is beginning to pour into Brazil. From all that I can learn, Mr. Root made an excellent impression.

To return to Rio Janeiro, I must say that this beautiful city, situated as it is just at the edge of the tropics, is a dream, and its main street, the Avenida Central, would be an ornament to any city of the world. The heat of the tropics does not appear to interfere with the industry of its inhabitants, for it is teeming with life. The streets of Brazilian cities are filled with pedestrians, but the absence of well-dressed ladies may, perhaps, be noted. The ladies in Brazil keep indoors a great deal, I am told, though in Rio they may be seen abroad in the late afternoon when it grows cool.

Old Rio, with its narrow, picturesque streets, is disappearing and a new Rio, quite modern, is developing. Yet even this new Rio is beautiful and artistic, for if the Anglo-Saxon often sacrifices the beautiful to his utilitarian instincts, in the Latin the "æsthetic" is never lost sight of. Rio has no skyscrapers, for the Brazilians do not like high edifices. The highest building is probably the new edifice of the newspaper on the Avenida, the *Jornal do Brasil*, one of the most important papers of the country. I observed in the city of Sao Paolo that nearly all the houses are low, very many of them being of one story. This is true even of the aristocratic residences on the fashionable Avenida. There are many streets in Sao Paolo which, with their low houses, give an idea of what Pompeii must have been.

In the harbor of Rio ships still anchor some distance from the shore, but docks are now in process of construction, and it will not be long before one may step from his vessel to the land. As I approached the landing place in the launch of the Lampert & Holt Company I observed the dome of the "Candelaria," the finest church in Rio, which is said to be also one of the most beautiful of South America. I lost it, however, in the maze of narrow streets when I had landed. On the other hand, I observed a very conspicuous building with a church on the summit of a hill, to which a broad flight of stairs led. Thither I directed my steps, little dreaming that I was to find there the most delightful hospitality. Almost breathless from the ascent and from the tropical heat, I reached the square in front of the church, where an officer was drilling a number of boys in uniform. I therefore concluded that I was at a military college. Entering the church, I found by the epitaph of its foundress that it dated from the seventeenth century. It proved to be the church of a Benedictine abbey. My reception was most cordial by the whole community, which consists of a number of nationalities. The abbot was absent in Europe, but as my good

fortune would have it, the Apostolic Nuncio, Mgr. Bavona, and the abbot of Sao Paulo arrived that day, and from both I received all possible marks of kindness. The latter, Dom Miguel Kruse, had spent some years in the United States. He gave up a great part of his day to me and furnished me opportunities of seeing Rio de Janeiro which I otherwise would not have had.

The Monastery of San Bento, perched on the hills above the harbor, has in revolutions of the past been used as a fortress, whence the guns could command the lower town. It has passed through the vicissitudes of the country, but now its once deserted cloisters again reëcho the voices of prayer, and within its halls the Brazilian youth enjoy the benefits of a Catholic education. The courtyard of the abbey, with its tropical features, offers a picture that will not easily be forgotten. From one of the windows of the abbey, on a far-off hill, may be seen the old Jesuit college, now a military hospital.

The Archbishop of Rio de Janeiro, Cardinal Alcoverde Cavalcanti de Albuquerque, is the only Cardinal in South America. His cathedral, rather small for such a large city, was once the church of the imperial family. The most prominent church in Rio de Janeiro is that of the Candelaria, a parish church belonging to one of the "Ormandae," or brotherhoods of the city. These "brotherhoods" are a Brazilian institution which serves to link the laity to the Church, even though their independence sometimes brings them into conflict with the ecclesiastical authorities.

Rio de Janeiro, the capital, it need not be said, is the most important city of Brazil, with a population of about 800,000. Santos is one of its most prominent ports and the largest coffee exporting city in the world. Ships of all nations may be seen moored to the docks at Santos, loading and unloading, while freight trains are running to and fro, hydraulic derricks are swinging immense boxes or pieces of machinery and immigrants are disembarking. Santos is situated on a bay between two mountain ranges, the "Serra do Mar." The town itself is perfectly flat, the most prominent object being the chapel of Montserrat, on the heights beyond the town. Not many years ago Santos was the dread of mariners, infested as it was by yellow fever; but Brazil has made immense strides in hygiene, and to-day yellow fever has disappeared from Rio de Janeiro and from Santos. Visitors need no longer be alarmed. The day has passed when whole ships' crews were killed off by the yellow fever in the harbor of Santos.

At Santos you may take the train for Sao Paulo, the second city of Brazil. The railroad will take you through one of the most beautiful sections of tropical mountain scenery it is possible to

imagine. Through numerous tunnels you pass, over bridges you roll across ravines that make you dizzy, while verdant heights tower over you and tropical vegetation surrounds you on all sides. At some points you behold the clouds down in the valley far beneath you, or you plunge into their foggy depths. At some distance from Santos the train is pulled up the heights by a cable for a number of miles until Alto da Serra is reached, when the descent begins. The Sao Paulo railroad, which is operated by an English company and pays large dividends, has performed some wonderful feats of engineering skill. Its main stations are truly beautiful, and the one at Sao Paulo may compare favorably with our best depots in the United States.

Sao Paulo lies at an elevation of 2,000 feet. Though outside of the tropics, its vegetation is truly tropical. The heat is moderated by the altitude, and the mornings and evenings are cool. The whole State of Sao Paulo is devoted to coffee raising, and the city possesses great wealth. While our steamer lay at Santos I ran up to Sao Paulo, where I spent the night at the Benedictine abbey. The energetic abbot, Dom Miguel Kruse, is building up one of the finest colleges in Brazil. Sao Paulo, with its polytechnic institute, its normal school, the Ladies of Sion, the American school and the Mackenzie Institute, is an important educational centre.

As to religion, there is a new Brazil as much as in politics and in material prosperity. The Catholicity of the colonial period has left its monuments in the old churches, nearly all in the style of the Renaissance of the period. But religion in Brazil had declined, and the abomination of desolation was prevailing in the holy place. I could not begin to tell you of the utter deterioration of religion which once existed. All this I learned since leaving Bahia. Then came the change, one of the most wonderful changes recorded in ecclesiastical history, and all within a period of twenty years. The empire fell—it was a Providence of God—and the State ceased to meddle with the Church. Breathing the atmosphere of freedom, the Church expanded, and to-day she finds herself in a most flourishing condition. The impulse is due to that great statesman, that noble Pontiff, that Leo XIII., whose eagle eye never ceased to scan the horizon. He sent Cardinal Gotti to Brazil, the reformation began in earnest. The old religious orders were nearly extinct; their ranks were recruited from Europe. The old Benedictine abbeys arose from their tomb, while the Carmelites and Franciscans, equally recruited from abroad, were born anew. Other orders, like the Praemonstratensians, Dominicans, Jesuits, Redemptorists, Salesians and Spanish Fathers of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, came to share in the good work, and to-day numerous foreign religious—German, Italian, Spanish, Dutch and Belgian—are laboring zealously in this portion

of the Lord's vineyard. The hierarchy has increased from less than ten to nearly forty Bishops, all of them excellent men. The secular clergy, too, is doing good work in the parochial ministry and gaining the respect of the people. A number of them are educated in Rome. Priests are the great need of Brazil, for vocations, especially among the better classes, are scarce and seminaries are few. For instance, there is one seminary for the whole province of Sao Paulo, with a small number of students. Should matters continue to advance and no untoward events occur, the Brazilian Church has now an era of prosperity ahead of her. Freemasonry is widespread, it is true, but it is not of the intensely hostile character of France or Italy, and thus far the Church is not hindered by the government. Perhaps the greatest danger lies in the possible increase of an anti-foreign sentiment, but as Brazil is a federal republic, each State being autonomous, it is not likely that persecution, should it break out in one State, would become general.

Brazil has made great advances since the fall of the empire. The climate is, perhaps, a drawback, but it is an obstacle that may be overcome. The resources of the country are unlimited. Its area is immense, but it needs population. If an enlightened government will not only hold out first inducements to immigration, but also continue its protection of foreign enterprises, eliminating all sources of fear to investors, there is no reason why Brazil may not become the foremost country of Latin America.

It is strange that while in Spanish America universities have existed from a very early period, Brazil has no university. There are faculties of law and of medicine, but no institution to give other degrees in theology, philosophy or letters. However, it is quite probable that the day is not far distant when a good university will be established.

The normal school at Sao Paulo owes its initiative to an American lady. The Mackenzie College, in the same city, has been carrying on educational work for years. Of late the American College and the Mackenzie Institute no longer teach religion, and many families stipulate in sending their children to them that no religion is to be taught. The danger in institutions of the kind for the youth of Brazil does not lie so much in the Protestantizing tendency as in the fact that indifferentism toward religion is increased. Many may be robbed of their Catholicity, but few, if any, will be made Protestants. Still, as I have said, converts are made, and the editor of an influential newspaper in Brazil is one of these. The only way to neutralize influences antagonistic to Catholicity is to instruct the Brazilian youth, as the Benedictines and others are doing. The Salesian Fathers in Sao Paulo are also conducting a large industrial

school for poor boys, and there are several schools for girls under the care of Sisterhoods.

I regret that my time in Brazil was so limited, but these lines may suggest further studies to others. An American priest, Father Caton, is teaching in the College of San Pento, at Sao Paulo, and I trust that some day he may add to our knowledge of the country. There is room for an exhaustive book on Brazil, published in a more convenient form than "New Brazil," by Marie Robinson Whright, which contains much information.

CHARLES WARREN CURRIER.

Washington, D. C.

AN INTERESTING CENTENARY.

THE approaching centenary of the introduction of the Irish Ursuline nuns into the United States revives the memory of an Irishwoman who contributed largely to the educational uplifting of the masses in her native land and to the extension of Catholic education on a religious basis in both hemispheres.

In 1810 the Very Rev. Dr. Koleman, V. G., of New York, proposed to the Ursuline community in Cork, founded by Nano Nagle, to establish a branch of their order in the Empire City. The nuns took no active steps towards the execution of the project until it was a second time submitted to their consideration in the following year. It opened up a very promising prospect for the development of their order and its work. A fine mansion in the midst of a beautiful park adjacent to the city was to be placed at their disposal, while the existence of a Jesuit college in the neighborhood was assumed to be a sufficient guarantee that their spiritual requirements would be well looked after. It was further stipulated that they would be put to no expense, and that they would be at liberty to return to Ireland, if they thought fit to do so, on the same conditions. Three of the community—Sister M. de Chantal Walsh, Sister M. Anne Fagan and Sister M. Paul Baldwin—were assigned to the new mission. Leaving Cork early in March, 1812, they sailed from Dublin on the 19th in the brig *Erin*. The days of ocean steamers, Atlantic grayhounds and luxurious liners, bringing two continents into closer proximity by means of floating palaces, which have improved away the perils and discomforts of traveling, were as yet far off. Before they had quite cleared Dublin Bay the vessel narrowly escaped being wrecked on a sandbank, and when they were nearing Newfoundland

they discovered one morning that they had been sailing all night in proximity to an immense iceberg rising four hundred feet above the sea level, which, if it had collided with their frail craft, would have shattered it to pieces. Placing themselves under the protection of Our Lady Star of the Sea, they reached New York safely on April 9, 1812, after a voyage of twenty days. Cordially greeted by Dr. Koleman, after a brief delay they took possession of their convent at Bloomingdale, within six miles of New York. They had been led to hope that their ranks would be recruited by American ladies sure to embrace their institute, but their hopes were deceived. Other disillusionments awaited them. Though their schools were rapidly filled, many of the pupils being Protestants, they completely failed to render those very self-assertive youth amenable to discipline. They missed, too, the religious consolations familiar and accessible to them in Ireland. Though living within six miles of the city, they were often whole weeks without an opportunity of hearing Mass, dependent on the casual visit of some priest who might happen to call on his way to a station of his mission. The little pioneer band got discouraged and hopeless, and were ultimately recalled to Ireland in 1815, failing to found a permanent mission during their sojourn of over three years. They found it very difficult to secure a passage, as all the vessels available were pressed into the service of the government to convey troops to check the progress of Napoleon, who had escaped from Elba and started on that last mad campaign which ended in his downfall. Dr. Burke, V. G., of Quebec, aided by two wealthy Irish Catholics, had to charter for the nuns' exclusive use a vessel which, sailing from Halifax, reached Cork on August 13. Thus ended the first abortive attempt of the spiritual children of Nano Nagle to gain a foothold on American soil.¹

¹ Though this was the first foundation sent to America by the Irish Ursulines, the order had already been established there through the missionary zeal of the French daughters of St. Angela Merici. As far back as the seventeenth century a colony of Ursulines from Bordeaux established themselves in Quebec, and were subsequently joined by Sisters from the congregation of Paris. When Canada was annexed by Great Britain, the Quebec Ursulines, fearing the hostility of the invaders, fled for a time from their convent, but returned shortly afterwards. In the beginning of the nineteenth century the community sent out a second colony to Boston. Another branch was established in New Orleans, and when the British troops were forced by General Jackson to retire from that city, by their unremitting attentions to the sick and wounded, earned the warmest thanks of the President of the Republic. An interesting relic of the pioneer period of the order in America is preserved in the gardens of the Quebec convent—an old ash tree, the sole survivor of the forest primeval, beneath which the foundress of the house, the Venerable Mother Mary of the Incarnation, styled by Bossuet "the Teresa of New France," used to sit while teaching the mysteries of the faith to the savage Hurons two hundred and seventy years ago. The Ursuline convent which once existed at Charlestown, near

A descendant of one of the most ancient Anglo-Norman families in Ireland, the progenitor of which came over with Strongbow in 1169 and won for himself and his sons titles and territories, Nano Nagle belonged to the branch which settled near Mallow, on the banks of southern Blackwater, and counted among its most notable members Sir Richard Nagle, Speaker of the Irish House of Commons in 1689, and his brother, Pierce Nagle, High Sheriff of Cork in 1688—the last Catholic who had held that office before O'Connell achieved the emancipation of Catholic Ireland. She was born at Ballygriffin, in the County of Cork, in 1728, the daughter of Garret Nagle, and related through her mother, one of the Mathews of Thomastown, to the famous Irish Capuchin, Father Theobald Mathew, the Apostle of Temperance; was first cousin to Edmund Burke, the most philosophical of British statesmen, whose father, Richard Burke, married a daughter of Patrick Nagle, of Shanballyduff; and could also claim kinship with the poet Spenser, for while the author of the "Fairy Queen" lived at Kilcolman Castle, near Doneraile, his eldest son, Sylvanus, espoused Ellen Nagle, eldest daughter of David Nagle, of Monanimy. The southern Nagles have not only written their names large in Irish history, but have linked it with a range of mountains—the Nagle Mountains—which overlook the beautiful valley of the Blackwater, the "swift Anniduff" and "Mulla mine" of Spenser, and "the Irish Rhine" now much frequented and admired by the ubiquitous tourist. It is a land as storied as it is picturesque. "From her windows," says her biographer, Rev. Dr. Hutch,² "she could see the venerable oaks waving around Carrigacunna Castle, and the sacred ruins of Monanimy, still peopled in her fancy with the weird old legends and traditions of the Knights Templars."

Not much is related of her earliest years, an epoch some biographers love to linger over, discerning, or fancying they discern therein foreglimpses of the future. She seems to have been an ordinarily good child of a vivacious temperament, and when her mother endeavored to check her youthful sallies her father would interpose and say that "his poor Nano would be a saint yet." Born at a time when Catholic education for Catholic children was pro-

Boston, was, on the night of Monday, August 11, 1834, burnt, wrecked and pillaged by fanatics during the Know-Nothing agitation, its innocent and defenseless inmates narrowly escaping perishing in the flames. The mission was founded in 1818 by two Limerick ladies, pupils of the Ursulines of Thurles, at the instance of the Rev. John Thayer, a converted Presbyterian minister and a native of Boston, and Bishop Cheverus, afterwards Cardinal Archbishop of Bordeaux. They were the daughters of Mr. James Ryan, and were joined by their youngest sister and cousin, Catherine Molyneux. The Charlestown convent was built in 1826.

² "Nano Nagle: Her Life, Her Labors, and Their Fruits," by William Hutch, D. D., p. 6.

scribed, when there was no alternative between running the risk of apostasy in a Protestant school or sending them abroad, which only the moneyed classes could afford to do, she was sent to a convent in Paris, where some of her relatives had formed part of the suite of the dethroned and exiled Stuart, James II.; for the Nagles were as ardent royalists as they were staunch Catholics, Sir Richard Nagle having followed his sovereign into exile after the battle of the Boyne, forfeiting thereby nearly five thousand acres in the baronies of Fermoy and Duhallow and considerable estates in Waterford.

Out of evil cometh good. The penal laws—a code which Edmund Burke described as “a machine of wise and elaborate contrivance and as well fitted for the oppression, impoverishment and degradation of a people as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man”—a code designed to stamp out Catholicity and make Catholic education in Ireland impossible, then in full force, which drove her to seek such education abroad, led to her becoming an instrument in the hands of Providence to foil that iniquitous design, to be the foundress of an order which was to foster the ancient faith and bring education on strictly Catholic lines within the reach of a people long socially and intellectually enslaved.

It was during her sojourn in Paris occurred the incident which was the turning point in her life—her religious vocation. One beautiful spring morning, her biographer relates, while most of the Parisians were asleep, and such as were not hastened to enjoy the needful repose after the gayeties and dissipation of the preceding night, Nano Nagle found herself in a well-appointed carriage which rumbled along the pavement of the Faubourg St. Germain. She was returning from a ball; the voluptuous music still sounded in her ears, the gay throng of pleasure's votaries still kept flitting across her brain; and the recollection of the soft flatteries she had listened to made her breast heave and her heart beat more quickly, as she hastened home to rest her weary limbs and prepare, it may be, for a similar round of pleasures on the morrow. In passing a church which lay along her route she glanced out of the carriage window and saw congregated on the steps a number of poor working people, who had assembled there at that early hour that they might avail themselves of the opportunity of assisting at the first Mass and asking God's blessing on their daily toil. That sight was as an arrow of grace shot through the heart of Nano Nagle. She contrasted the position of these poor work people with her own, as they stood relatively in the sight of God. *They seeking the one thing necessary, she a slave to the perishable world; they fervent in their piety, she tepid and all but cold; they devoting the early morning to the worship of their Creator, preparatory to a day of useful labor, she devot-*

ing the same hours to indolent repose, to be succeeded by an afternoon of purposeless, if not sinful frivolities. The contrast was too striking, and in her own heart was she forced to confess that the poor laborers were walking in the right path, and that she, the belle of the salons of Paris, was treading in the ways that lead to perdition. Grace nurtured the seed that it had sown in the breast of Nano Nagle, and she at once resolved to bid adieu to the world and its pleasures and devote the remainder of her life to the service of God.³

The Ireland to which she returned about 1750 was very different from the Ireland of to-day. It was an Ireland in which "the peasant scarce had leave to live," when the tiller of the soil had "no tenure but a tyrant's will," when Catholics,

Forbid to plead,
Forbid to read,
Disarmed, disfranchised, imbecile,

lived like helots in their own land; when all the concessions granted to them by the Treaty of Limerick, "broken ere yet the ink wherewith 'twas writ could dry," had been revoked; when "Papists" were prohibited to teach school, either publicly or privately, under a penalty of £20 fine and three months' imprisonment, or parents to send their children abroad to be educated, under the penalty of forfeiting all right to sue in the law courts, deprivation of all goods and lands for life and inability to be guardian, executor or administrator or to take a legacy or receive a deed of gift; when Catholics had been disarmed and priests banished from the kingdom, under penalty of being hanged should they attempt to return; when "the ferocious Acts of Anne," as Edmund Burke stigmatized them, provided that "all converts in public employments, members of Parliament, barristers, attorneys or officers of any courts of law, shall educate their children Protestants;" when a Catholic could not even be usher in a Protestant school, and a reward of £10 was offered for the discovery of each "Popish" schoolmaster or usher; when any magistrate might summon before him any "Papist" of eighteen years, and if he refused to disclose the residence of a Catholic priest or schoolmaster, commit him to prison for twelve months, without the option of bail, or fine him £20; when, in 1759, the Irish Chancellor authoritatively declared from the bench that "the laws did not presume a Papist to exist in the kingdom, nor could they breathe without the connivance of government." Of this atrocious tyranny Edmund Burke wrote: "While this restraint upon foreign and domestic education was part of a horrible and impious system of servitude, the members were well fitted to the body. To render men patient under a deprivation of all the rights of human nature, everything which could give them

³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 11, 12.

a knowledge or feeling of those rights was rationally forbidden. To render humanity fit to be insulted, it was fit that it should be degraded. Indeed, I have ever thought that the prohibition of the means of improving our rational nature to be the worst species of tyranny that the insolence and perverseness of mankind ever dared to exercise."⁴ Although the severity with which it was exercised was relaxed during the Viceroyalty of the Earl of Chesterfield (1745-1747), when to conciliate the downtrodden Irish they were permitted to open their obscure chapels, hidden in byways, for public worship—a concession extorted by the alarm aroused by the Stuart revolt in Scotland, which did not imply the revocation of any of the penal laws, still unrepealed—the laws against education continued as stringent as ever. It was only in 1782—the year of the Volunteers and the Dungannon Convention—that Catholics were legally authorized to teach school.⁵ Meanwhile, the mass of the Catholics had to get their education by stealth or at some hedge school, where

—stretched on mountain fern
The pupil and his teacher met, feloniously to learn.

Their condition was deplorable. Touched by it, Miss Nagle wished to do something to ameliorate their lot. She found them sunk in enforced ignorance, not through their fault, but through the State's neglect of one of its fundamental duties. She saw how great and urgent were their educational needs, and wished to supply them, but she was confronted by the risk of infringing the laws of William and Anne, still in force, which might involve her relatives in pains and penalties and afford a pretext for further persecution. Despairing of being able to do anything, she resolved to leave Ireland and seek admittance into a foreign convent, and for that purpose returned to France. Still the idea of bringing relief to the persecuted children of her race pursued her, and taking counsel with a Jesuit, to whom she opened her mind, he told her God willed her to return to Ireland and labor for the instruction and sanctification of the poor. Others whom she consulted were of the same view as her spiritual director. "Nothing," she wrote to her friend, Miss Fitzsimons (July 17, 1769), "would have made me come home but the decision of the clergymen that I should run a great risk of salvation if I did not follow the inspiration." Her own decision was the result of a simple incident which points its own moral and shows the importance and force of good example. Her father having died during her absence in Paris, on her return she joined her mother and sister, who were then sojourning in Dublin. One day she asked her pious sister to get made up a splendid silk dress, the materials

⁴ Letter to a peer in Ireland, quoted by Dr. Hutch, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

⁵ Twenty-first and twenty-second George III., c. 62.

for which she had purchased in Paris. She often said she was never so edified or astonished as when her sister disclosed to her in confidence that she had disposed of the silk for the purpose of relieving a distressed family. This circumstance, together with the death of this sister soon afterwards, wrought so powerfully on the heart of Miss Nagle as perfectly to disengage it from the fashionable world, which she tasted so much of and enjoyed until then. She frequently in after years remarked to her Sisters in religion that it was this trifling occurrence which fixed her determination to devote the remainder of her life to God in the service of the poor.⁶

Her resolve was no sooner taken than she set to work. There is a conflict of opinion among her biographers as to whether she began in Dublin or Cork. Bishop Coppinger, her first biographer and to some extent her contemporary, states that she opened her first school in Dublin, but Dr. Hutch avers that the evidence which would give to Cork the honor of Miss Nagle's first school is overwhelming and rests mainly on her own written testimony.

Cork in her time was as different from Cork at present as the Ireland of her day and ours. It sadly needed a reforming hand, and it was the gentle hand of a delicate lady that reformed it. As contemporary records depict it, its ill-kept streets were the scene of daily and nightly turbulence. Faction fights—a relic or reminder of the old tribal conflicts—were of frequent occurrence. Rioting had become so common that in 1769 it was not safe for any person to stand at his door without some weapon of defense. Cock-fighting and bull-baiting were carried on in open day. There were no police, and it was with the utmost difficulty that the City Sheriffs, with the aid of the military stationed in guard houses, preserved any semblance of law and order, often set at defiance by the unruly populace. In addition to this, the drink habit, which affected all classes in days when hard drinking was the rage, added fuel to fire in fanning the flame of disorder and demoralizing the community.

For a weak woman to try and stem the tide of corruption seemed Quixotic; it was like cleansing the Augean stables. But though weak in body, she was strong in spirit, and her spirituality strengthened her will-power. Nothing could give a better idea of the woman and her work than the simple, unadorned language in which she relates its humble beginning in a letter to Miss Fitzsimons on July 17, 1769. "When I arrived," she writes, "I kept my design a profound secret, as I knew if it were spoken of I should meet with opposition on every side, particularly from my own immediate family, as to all appearances they would suffer from it. My confessor was the only person I told of it, and as I could not appear in the affair,

⁶ *Annals S. P. Convent, Cork*, note, pp. 3, 4, 5.

I sent my maid to get a good mistress and to take in thirty poor girls. When the little school was settled I used to steal there in the morning. My brother thought I was at the chapel. This passed on very well until one day a poor man came to him to beg of him to speak to me to take his child into my school, on which he came in to his wife and me, laughing at the conceit of a man who was mad and thought I was in the situation of a schoolmistress. Then I owned that I had set up a school, on which he fell into a violent passion and said a vast deal on the bad consequences that may follow. His wife is very zealous and so is he, but worldly interest blinded him at first. He was soon reconciled to it. He was not the person I most dreaded would be brought into trouble about it; it was my uncle Nagle, who is, I think, the most disliked by the Protestants of any Catholic in the kingdom. I expected a great deal from him. The best part of the fortune I have I received from him. When he heard of it he was not at all angry at it, and in a little time they were so good as to contribute largely to support it, and I took in children by degrees, not to make any noise about it in the beginning. In about nine months I had about 200 children. When the Catholics saw what service it did, they begged that for the convenience of the children I would set up schools at the other end of the town from where I was, to be under my care and direction, and they promised to contribute to the support of them. With this request I readily complied, and the same number of children that I had were taken in, and at the death of my uncle I supported them all at my own expense. I did not intend to take boys, but my sister-in-law made it a point, and said she would not permit any of my family to contribute to the schools unless I did so, on which I got a master and took in only forty boys. They are in a house by themselves and have no communication with the others. At present, however, I have two schools for boys and five for girls. The former learn to read, and when they have the Douay catechism by heart they learn to write and cipher. There are three schools where the girls learn to read, and when they have the catechism by heart they learn to work. They all hear Mass every day, say their morning and night prayers, say their catechism in each school by question and answer all together. Every Saturday they all say the beads, the grown girls every evening. They go to confession every month and to Communion when the confessor thinks proper. The schools are opened at eight; at twelve the children go to dinner; at five they leave school. The workers do not begin their night prayers until six, after their beads. I prepare a set for first Communion twice a year, and I may truly say it is the only thing that gives me any trouble. In the first place, I think myself very incapable, and in the beginning, being

obliged to speak for upwards of over four hours, and my chest not being so strong as it had been, I spat blood, which I took care to conceal for fear of being prevented from instructing the poor. It has not the least bad effect now. When I have done preparing them at each end of the town, I feel myself like an idler that has nothing to do, though I speak almost as much as when I prepare them for their first Communion. I find not the least difficulty in it. I explain the catechism as well as I can in one school or the other every day, and if every one thought as little of labor as I do, they would have little merit. I often think my schools will never bring me to heaven, as I only take delight and pleasure in them. You see, it has pleased the Almighty to make me succeed, when I had everything, as I may say, to fight against. I assure you I did not expect a farthing from any mortal towards the support of my schools, and I thought I should not have more than fifty or sixty girls until I got a fortune; nor did I think I should have a school in Cork. I began in a poor, humble manner, and though it pleased the Divine will to give me severe trials in this foundation, yet it is to show that it is His work, and has not been effected by human means. I can assure you my schools are beginning to be of service to a great many parts of the world. This is a place of great trade. They are heard of, and my views are not for one object alone. If I could be of any service in saving souls in any part of the globe, I would willingly do all in my power."

She not only taught the children, but she begged for them from door to door, enduring many humiliations and hardships in the toilsome, self-imposed task of collecting a subscription limited to a shilling a month, although at the time she was suffering from a spitting of blood and ophthalmia. After her death such prominent and angry excrescences were observed on the soles of her feet as made it a matter of surprise how she could by any possible exertion even stand upon them, much less walk as she did, so much and so constantly, during the last three years of her life. It was said there was not a garret in Cork she had not entered. She visited the most miserable haunts in the city in order to discover those who needed the advantages which her schools could confer, but who from some reason or another were slow to avail of them.⁷ "How often," says Bishop Coppinger, "have we seen her passing with steady composure through the rigors of every season to tend her little flock? How often have we seen her after a well-spent day returning through the darkness of the night, dripping with rain, mingled in the bustling crowd, moving thoughtfully along by the faint glimmering of a wretched lantern, withholding from herself in this manner the

⁷ Dr. Hutch, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

necessaries of life to administer the comforts of it to others." She not only fed the minds of her protégés with knowledge, but their stomachs with food, besides clothing their bodies.

Wishful of securing the continuance of the good work, she decided to place it under the charge of a religious community. Here again the penal laws interposed a serious obstacle. It was a time when religious orders, even now only tolerated and, strictly speaking, illegal, were proscribed. There were then only a few convents in Ireland, whose inmates led a stealthy and precarious existence, in hourly peril of imprisonment, or exile, or even some heavier penalty. By the advice of Father Doran, a Jesuit, and the Rev. Francis Moylan—subsequently Bishop of Kerry and later translated to the See of Cork—she decided to invite the Ursuline nuns to take charge of her schools. "The members of religious communities on the Continent," says Dr. Hutch,⁸ "did not appear over anxious to come as missionaries into Ireland, principally because they feared the harsh and cruel penalties which might be enforced under the then existing penal laws, and in the next place because of that natural antipathy which they felt to leave the country of their birth and the convent in which they had been professed—to both of which they were bound by so many sacred ties, and by remembrances hallowed at once by nature and religion. However, God never fails to raise up workers for the execution of His designs, and in the present instance He inspired four young ladies to place themselves unreservedly at the disposal of Nano Nagle as the germ of the future Ursulines in Ireland. These were: Miss Fitzsimons (Mother Angela), Margaret Nagle (Mother Joseph), cousin of the foundress; Miss Coppering, a member of the Barryscourt family and cousin to the then Duchess of Norfolk, and Nano Kavanagh, who was closely allied to the noble house of Ormonde." After making a novitiate in the Ursuline convent in the Faubourg St. Jacques, Paris, they returned, on May 9, 1771, in company with the Abbé Moylan and Mrs. Kelly, one of the Ursuline community at Dieppe, a venerable and holy *religieuse* of Irish birth, who volunteered to be temporary superiorress of the new Sisterhood, to occupy the house Miss Nagle built for their reception in Douglas street in such an unpretentious and unobtrusive manner so that it might not attract notice as a convent. Up to this time she had not disclosed to her family the fact that she was about to establish a religious community in Cork. The selfsame reasons which from the first induced her to keep secret the opening of her schools rendered it doubly imperative to conceal as much as possible her views in regard of the foundation of a convent. However, the matter could not longer remain undiscovered, and she

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 48.

determined to be herself the bearer of the intelligence to her friends. For this purpose she proceeded, in the summer of 1770, to Bath, from whence she wrote to Miss Fitzsimons: "It gives them all great pleasure that I should be the means of promoting such a good work, and my sisters-in-law are as eager to get good subjects for it as we could be. I hope you will approve of my manner of acting, as the less noise is made about affairs of this kind in this country, the better." The sequel showed the wisdom of her cautious method of procedure; for, when the fact was noised abroad in the city, the bigoted Protestant Corporation of Cork endeavored to suppress the convent and expel the nuns, but were induced to desist by the sane arguments of a broad-minded corporator, one Alderman Francis Carleton, who pointed out that the statute on which they based their action (9th William III., chap. 1, sec. 8), which bound them to apprehend and commit the nuns to prison, with a view to their transportation, had, owing to the increased number of Catholics and their improved social conditions, become practically a dead letter, and that "the great Protestant Constitution" could hardly be imperilled by a few piously disposed ladies living together "to teach poor children, drink tea and say their prayers." Still, though tolerated, the small community lived in constant fear of the penal laws; so much so that it was only by stealth and on the more solemn festivals that they ventured to put on the religious habit, which they did not finally assume until November 11, 1779, eight years after they had entered the convent, which was placed under the special protection of the Blessed Virgin and St. Joseph, and in which Mass was said for the first time on September 22, 1771.

Not long after the introduction of the Ursulines Miss Nagle realized that a mistake had been made. That order being chiefly occupied in the education of the daughters of the upper and middle classes, was not specially adapted to the work she had initiated—the education of the children of the poor. "Miss Nagle's heart," says Mother De Pazzi in her manuscript life of the foundress, "was centred in the *poor*; her whole aim was to reform *them*, and though her efforts did not flow into that channel to which all her solicitude was directed, still they were thrown into one of very great importance, too. Her views were greatly disappointed, so far from being fulfilled, when she found that the Ursulines were bound by their constitutions to enclosure and to the instruction of the higher classes in society. Consequently they could not, as she wished and intended, visit the sick and poor abroad, nor devote themselves to the instruction of the poor at home. This was *her* object, her most ardent and earnest desire; so that the establishment of the Ursulines in Cork was more the accomplishment of God's designs than of Miss Nagle's.

She was, however, the docile instrument of God's mercy towards thousands in the city, and though she discovered the institute not to be altogether according to her own heart, this did not cool her zeal for its interests." It is clear from this that her primitive project rather anticipated, in one aspect at least, the work of another Irish foundress—Mary Aikenhead—than foreshadowed the creation of an order of cloistered nuns.

She decided, therefore, to found another community more in conformity with her views. This led to the foundation of the Presentation order of nuns, a teaching Sisterhood, begun toward the close of 1775, when she gathered around her a few pious women who wished to devote their time, their labor and themselves to the immediate exclusive service of God in the persons of those we have always with us as His earthly representatives—the poor. Although she had gone to great expense in erecting a convent for the Ursulines, she had still enough left to build another in the same street and quite adjacent to it. This occasioned some passing friction between her and the Ursulines and the parish priest (Dr. Moylan), the former fearing that a division of Miss Nagle's solicitude might prove prejudicial to them. It went so far that the pastor threatened to demolish the unfinished convent and ordered her to commence her work in another part of the city, but she persisted, saying that if banished from thence, she would never try to pursue her intended object in Cork, but retire to some other part of Ireland, where she would meet with no opposition, but more encouragement to effect her purposes on behalf of those whom she always carried in her heart—the poor.* The parish priest, who later, as Bishop of Cork, was one of her strongest supporters in her good work, gave in, subordinating his personal views to those of one who, he said, was led by the Spirit of God. The result again proved her wisdom. The Ursulines, not the Presentation nuns, removed from the parish, to found in the suburb of Blackrock a convent, long known far and wide for the excellent teaching imparted to the daughters of the higher classes in its boarding school.

The first subjects who joined Miss Nagle in her new undertaking were Miss Fouhy, Miss Elizabeth Burke and Miss Mary Anne Collins, who in 1775 went to live in what Mother De Pazzi describes as the "lowly, comfortless abode in Douglas street"—the small house into which she received the Ursulines on their first arrival from France, and in which they continued to reside until the convent

* Manuscript Life of Mother Nagle, by the late Mrs. M. de Pazzi, South Presentation Convent, Cork.

¹⁰ They did not ordinarily wear the religious habit, except on festival and ceremony days, until 1803.

intended for them was completed. On June 29, 1776, Nano Nagle and her three companions received the religious habit,¹⁰ from which year dates the establishment of what is now known as the Presentation Order. She herself never contemplated anything but a simple congregation devoted to works of charity among the poor, not bound to enclosure or making solemn vows—servants of the poor, whom they were to be free to seek in their lowly hovels of wretchedness and want. Their manner of life was austere and self-denying; their dress a plain black gown, over which was worn a black silk handkerchief, crossed in front, and a plain cap fitting closely and made tight by a broad black ribbon fastened round the head. When attending the schools in various parts of the city they were enveloped in long mode cloaks (a garment used in those days), the hoods of which were drawn over the small black bonnets. The new convent, finished towards the close of 1777, was opened on the Christmas of that year, when she dined fifty beggars, waiting on them at table with inexpressible joy and singular charity, helping them as their menial servant, a custom she scrupulously observed while she lived.¹¹ The first name she adopted was "Sisters of the Sacred Heart of Jesus," the rule being drawn up for them by the curé of St. Sulpice. "Edifying as was Miss Nagle's previous life," says Mother De Pazzi, "her demeanor as a religious was far more striking, the evening of this great woman's life being the most brilliant portion of her earthly career. Her humility, her regularity, her application to prayer, her mortification, her charity (which was unbounded) were never at any other time so conspicuous. One can only do them justice by saying that her life was the Gospel and the Counsels perfectly reduced to practice." On the 24th of June, 1777, they pronounced their simple vows in presence of Dr. Butler,¹² Bishop of Cork. From that time until 1793, when the rule of the order was approved by Pope Pius VI., they made only annual vows, and those in private.

"The sainted foundress," records Dr. Hutch in his admirable biography,¹³ "often told the infant community that she never expected to see her little congregation elevated to the rank of a religious order."¹⁴ She was content to see it struggle on in its path of humble usefulness. In one respect her words were prophetic, for she was sleeping her last sleep when Pope Pius VI. approved of the Presentation rules; but Catholic Ireland must rejoice that her wishes on this head were disregarded, and that the mustard seed sown in

¹⁰ Mother de Pazzi, *op. cit.*, quoted by Dr. Hutch, p. 83.

¹¹ Lord Dunboyne, whose name is perpetuated in the Dunboyne House, Maynooth.

¹² *Op. cit.*, p. 88.

¹³ To which position it was raised by Pius VII. by a Brief dated April 9, 1805.

Douglas street has, under the fostering care of the Church, grown to be a great tree, whose branches extend over four continents."

She literally wore herself out in the service of the poor until exhausted nature could stand the strain no longer. It was only death that put an end to her labors. For over six years she toiled unceasingly as superiorress, spending altogether nearly thirty years in the service of God and of the poor. "Of a constitution naturally delicate," writes the reverend author last quoted, "she was at an early period of her life afflicted with a spitting of blood. The fatigue of continual speaking in school, sometimes for five hours together; the cold and wet of the street, to which she was continually exposed; the corporal austerities which she practiced; the opposition she encountered in the execution of her designs, and the severe mental trials to which she was literally a martyr—all told upon her constitution, and about the year 1784 it became painfully evident to her Sisters that their holy foundress was hastening to her reward. In the early part of that year her health began to fail more rapidly. The Sisters noticed that she was losing that buoyancy of spirit which had so often cheered them in the recreation hall after the labors of the day. The face, once a type of perfect female beauty, was prematurely old and wrinkled; her appetite was not that of a healthy person, and a troublesome cough, echoing through the corridors of the house all night, told but too plainly that Miss Nagle's chest affection would ere long assert its supremacy. The curtain was about to fall. She knew it, and though death could have few terrors for one whose blameless—nay, singularly holy—life had been spent in God's service, she no sooner felt the approach of the destroyer than she demanded to be fortified with the last sacraments of the Church. She received them with marked piety, and then, calling her little community around her, she made what may be termed her last will and testament. She had few earthly goods to leave them, but she bequeathed to them a treasure which she prized beyond every other—the poor of Jesus Christ. She bade them spend themselves for the poor; and that their efforts might be crowned with success, she gave them a parting injunction, which is, indeed, worthy of being written in golden letters over the door of every Presentation convent—"Love one another as you have hitherto done." Simple words these, but embodying in a single sentence the spirit of Nano Nagle, as well as of her Divine Master, and 'the disciple whom Jesus loved.' For the discourse of the Redeemer at the Last Supper was but a homily of love; and, if tradition speaks truly, the Apostle of Patmos in the closing years of his life used to preach but one sermon, and that very brief—"My little children, love one another." Miss Nagle gave the selfsame injunction to her spiritual children, and, having

imparted to them her dying blessing, she resigned her holy soul into her Maker's hands on the 20th of April, 1784, being then in the fifty-sixth year of her age."¹⁵ Her limbs were so feeble towards the close of her life that she was obliged to use a stick when walking, which stick, with a plate inscribed with her name inserted in it, may be seen in one of the reception rooms of the South Presentation Convent, Cork, along with some other interesting memorials of the foundress. She had to stop frequently in the streets to get a little strength to proceed in her long and painful walks. "They were, indeed, so many steps on the road to eternal life," wrote her friend, Miss Fitzsimons. She added to her usual austerities that of fasting every Wednesday and Friday on bread and water, enjoining secrecy on the subject to all the Sisters during her life; took the discipline four times each week during the *Miserere*; gave instructions three hours daily during Lent, fasting, and passed eleven hours on the last Holy Thursday night before the Blessed Sacrament, kneeling all the time, as she never was seen to sit during exposition. Her fervor increased so much towards the end that Miss Fitzsimons believed she lost all sense of bodily pain or suffering. She read the Passion three times at different schools on the Monday and Tuesday of the last Holy Week she spent on earth without experiencing the least sense of fatigue. Drenched with rain one day when making the round of her schools, the next day she was seized with a spitting of blood, and to a lady who remonstrated with her, requesting her to go no farther, she replied: "What a coward you are! I have a mind to go to the schools and walk it off as I am used to do." But a weakness ensued, and she had to walk home for the last time. She never complained, and had hopes of recovering till about twenty-four hours before her death. Then she desired three of her favorite children to pray for her recovery, if it was for the glory of God, that she might have more time to prepare for eternity. The doctors would not permit her to receive the last sacraments till about seven hours before she died, lest the application and her extraordinary devotion would exhaust her too much, as they had still hopes that God would spare her longer to the poor and distressed, to whom she was a tender mother.¹⁶ But she lives in her order, which has preserved her spirit and perpetuated her work. *Etiam mortua adhuc loquitur.* In the words of a fervent admirer of the foundress quoted by her biographer:¹⁷ "Dead in the flesh, she lives in the lives and hearts and hopes of ten millions of Irish Catholics dispersed over

¹⁵ *Op. cit.*, pp. 89-91.

¹⁶ Letter of Miss Fitzsimons to Miss Mullaly, of Dublin, dated Cork, May 21, 1784, quoted by Dr. Hutch, pp. 91-93.

¹⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 95.

the globe. She speaks beyond the Atlantic to the child of the hardy fisher beyond the snows of Newfoundland. On the shores of the Pacific her voice is heard in many a crowded audience among the miners of California. In Australia, on the banks of the Paramatta, among the orange groves of Sydney and across the straits, in the streets of Tasmania; under the Southern Cross, as on the confines of the Arctic regions, the living influence of this deceased female outlaw¹⁸ is felt. At home, in every dell in her native Desmond, her name is uttered with benediction. Millions have dedicated their daughters to her care, so that since the days of St. Bride of Kildare—the Mary of Ireland, as she was called—no woman has had her name so interwoven with the Irish race as the venerable Nano Nagle of Cork."

The Dungarvan Convent, a filiation from Waterford, which has just celebrated the centenary of its foundation, owed its origin, like the Cork convent and the order itself, to a number of pious women mutually agreeing, for the greater glory of God, to devote their lives to the instruction of poor children, and its erection was facilitated by the donation of £1,000 by Mr. Pierce Barron, of Saraville. Its genesis was a free school in Jail lane, and the first essay in conventional life was made in a private house in Church street, from whence, in 1822, they removed to a convent built in the same street, which in 1858 gave place to the present larger and much admired convent and schools. "There are well authenticated traditions in connection with the first inmates of the Dungarvan Convent of the Presentation Order," says Dr. Hutch, "which would go far to prove that while the outside world is nowadays all but atheistic, the daughters of Nano Nagle emulate in the cloister the penances and the sanctity of the servants of God in the olden times. Some of them were remarkable for possessing in an eminent degree the spirit of prayer, in which holy exercise they would spend whole hours together whenever their doing so did not interfere with the discharge of any other duty. One of them, now deceased, on days of vacation from the schools, was frequently known to thank God at midday that previous to that hour she had spoken to Him alone. Many of the deceased Sisters were remarkable also for their spirit of mortification, and in some instances it was discovered after their death that they had been in the habit of using instruments of penance. Others, again, would use no protection against intense cold in winter. A novice who did not live to make her profession, at a period when the community was still in its infancy, had attained such a degree of perfection that she was regarded as a saint. This

¹⁸ Allusion to the "wings" of the Emancipation Act of 1829, which "outlawed" the religious orders.

young fervent soul would often in confidence give expression before her seniors to her determined resolution never to cease her efforts until she had brought herself to such a state of indifference as to be insensible to all that was not God. So much did she dread the loss of time that in her walks with her companions her first care after purifying her intention was to remind them gently to turn every moment to good account, and should she chance to hear a useless remark, she would sweetly rejoin: ‘Sister, this remark will not surely rank among your most perfect actions on the day of judgment.’ People may smile and say this is old-fashioned sanctity, but it is sanctity, nevertheless, approved of and practiced by the greatest saints, and not to be lightly condemned until the philosophers of the twentieth century shall have discovered a surer path to heaven.”

In 1833 four Presentation nuns from Galway crossed the Atlantic to found a house of their order in St. John’s, Newfoundland, which in course of time established eleven filiations or offshoots of the mother house in that British colony, where the early Irish settlers, like their co-religionists in Ireland, gave proof of their steadfastness in the faith, heroically standing to their guns under fire of persecution; for the pitiless penal laws pursued them even across the broad ocean. San Francisco gave a cordial welcome to four Sisters from Midleton in September, 1854, who began their work in a little shanty (for the city had not yet been regularly laid down, the gold mania engrossing all the settlers’ thoughts) until a wealthy Irish-American, D. T. Murphy, donated \$20,000 to purchase a site for a convent. In New York, where the Ursulines in 1812 failed to make a permanent foundation, the Presentation nuns, in 1874, under more favorable conditions, were successful. The magnificent work they have since done in the sphere of education is a work that has a most important bearing upon the progress of Catholicity in the United States. It was in the fitness of things that Nano Nagle, through her spiritual daughters, should be privileged to have a share in the building up and extension of the Church in America, in laying the foundations of which her friend and fellow-citizen, Dr. England,¹⁹

¹⁹ Dr. England, before he was nominated to the See of Charleston (1820), which comprised the two Carolinas and Georgia, had been, in 1808, chaplain to the North Presentation Convent, Cork, where his sister, one of the community, lived to a very advanced age. In 1834 he introduced the Ursulines from Blackrock into his vast diocese, where his stupendous exertions for the strengthening and spread of the faith earned for him the title of “Light of the American Hierarchy.” Even when a student in Carlow he paved the way for the introduction of the Presentation nuns into that town. He had early knowledge of the educational disadvantages under which the people labored. His father was obliged to support himself in early life by teaching mathematics and land surveying, and in order to do this with safety, at a period when most rigorous enactments were in force against Catholic schoolmasters, he was forced to take refuge in the mountains, where he

the illustrious Bishop of Charleston, labored so strenuously in the past.

R. F. O'CONNOR.

Cork, Ireland.

THE PERIODICITY OF ANTI-CATHOLIC CALUMNIES.

CALUMNIES, like comets, appear to move in parabolas or ellipses, and to have their regular periods of return to their starting-points in the celestial hemisphere. This fact is suggested by the report of a symposium over the remarkable address on "Religion and the Mores" delivered by the late Professor Sumner, of Yale University, at the fourth annual meeting of the American Sociological Society, in New York, last year. The symposium appears in the *American Journal of Sociology* for March last. It furnishes, no doubt in perfect sincerity and ingenuousness, a most amusing study in the idiosyncrasies of the professorial mind. Several eminent pundits took part in the discussion which followed the address. Each of these maintained an independent view of the soundness of the theory propounded by Professor Sumner—namely, that religion is the result of man's environment and the "mores" or social tendencies of certain cycles or ages of human society. This is not a direct denial of a revelation of God, but it is none the less a denial. It must strike one as not a little paradoxical that out of the same atmosphere that produces this agnosticism as regards a Creator God there should be found proceeding a ready willingness to believe in an infernal power which or who exercises unlimited sway over the hidden things of nature, and a concurrent belief that the Catholic religion is the heir-at-law of the old pagan cult of Egypt, Greece, Rome, Mexico and all other nations where the deities of blood and cruelty had their reeking and smoking altars and tumuli on the summits of the hills and the gloomy recesses of the dense forests. The culture that denies the revelation of a beneficent Deity is apparently satisfied to acknowledge the claim of the revelation of a mighty Spirit of Evil. It recognizes an Ahriman, but ignores the corollary of an Ormuzd, for so in the archaic Persian cult the mystery of evil in the world was put in the position of a mechanical

remained until the partial relaxation of the penal laws, which followed the declaration of American independence, permitted his return to Cork. In that city he attained a position of comparative prosperity before the birth of his eldest son, the future Bishop of Charleston. Young England pursued his early studies in a Protestant school, there being none other, and, being the only Catholic pupil, was subjected to many galling insults on account of his faith, not only by his companions, but even by his master.

contrivance and a mathematical arrangement of the great hidden forces that rule the universe.

The political economy of the school of Herbert Spencer and John Stuart Mill came after a time to be called "the dreary science." The new pseudo-science of sociology has taken its place in the realm of the monotonous and the bewildering. It would seem that a consciousness of this repellancy in character of the study has become too much for some of the professorial exponents of the new cult; hence the attempt to infuse an element of attraction by way of divertissement, in the shape of a revival of the old calumny that the Catholic faith and ritual are nothing more than the resuscitation of beliefs and attendant ritual that prevailed over a vast proportion of the known globe, from the twilight ages of history down to the Christian era.

"The Rôle of Magic" is the subject of a lengthened treatise in the *American Journal of Sociology* for May of the present year, from the pen of Professor Thomson Shotwell, of Columbia University. The learned teacher assumes at the outset that the literature on magic is defective, but it yet may be made satisfactory he would appear to imply. He says:

"It is incredible that so vital a subject should have so long escaped satisfactory treatment. But the incredible is true. For there is not an exhaustive description or analysis of magic—simply as magic—in existence. It fills many treatises on other things; its dark seams run across the pages of practically every work on comparative religion; investigations on early law touch on its domain; primitive institutions are seen to have in it many of their roots; and it is from these outside angles that we get our impressions of its mysterious rôle. But apart from a single essay, which claims to be only a sketch, and to which we refer below, there is no satisfactory treatment of magic as magic and not as an adjunct to something else. There are no encyclopedias of magic science."

This fact need not have demanded the space of a dozen lines of thought from any learned professor. There cannot be any such analysis or diagnosis of a thing which is either a fraud of the human mind or a wonderful mystery of the occult. Psychology has demonstrated that maleficent powers exercise an influence in the hidden world and over human action—how or why it is not given to mortal to know as yet. Until this knowledge is man's, there can be no reliable text-book on magic.

Several writers have boldly asserted that the Catholic religion is nothing more than a system superimposed upon the old pagan theological one, and adapting the ruins of that system to the new one, changing only the names and the attribution. This vulgar

process is repudiated by Professor Shotwell, chiefly, it would seem, not because there was no evolutionary relationship established between paganism and Christianity, but because the mode of proving it adopted has been too clumsy and unscientific. The author of "The Golden Bough," Professor J. G. Frazer, of Cambridge, is especially objectionable to him, by reason of his inconsequentiality. He says of his *schema* of evolutionary religion:

"According to Frazer, magic is the opposite of religion. It is a rude and mistaken science, in which man began his struggle with the mysterious forces of the world. By spell and by charm he met those dangerous powers whose presence he saw revealed in the multifold crises of his life: in sickness and death, in the chances of the hunt or the perils of war, in birth, in sexual relations, in the terror of spilt blood, in the gloom of the night, in the march of the storm, in all the terrible and the wonderful in his miracle-wrought universe."

Magic is no "science"—or else Professor Shotwell would not have to complain of want of definitions or text-books. It is no more a science than sin is: it is a terrible power exerted over the sinful mind by the arch-enemy of human souls. It is the possession of many in the world to-day, as it was when the Egyptian sorcerers vied with Moses in the field of miracle-working and when St. Patrick was opposed in his work of conversion in Ireland by the fierce Druids who tended the Baal fires on the hills and cast their malign spells, at the prayer of devotees, in the dark recesses of their sacred groves by the furtive rays of the midnight moon. The spiritualism of to-day is the same cult, differing only in the mode of its production and its formulas, as the power which enabled the Witch of Endor to call up the dead whom Saul wished to question. Against this awful power the Catholic Church has had to build its defenses from the earliest years of her existence. The Apostles had to deal with it—as in the case of Elymas, the magician; and the case of Simon Magus is a notable instance of the temerity with which the followers of the impious cult were inspired when they went so far as to compete with God Himself in miraculous proofs.

The proofs that true religion is everlastingly inimical to false pretense are many, and yet men like Professor Shotwell are constantly turning up to maintain the astounding theory that both are identical in source, and in many cases in regard to ritual and formulas. Thus we find Columbia's professor expressing astonishment at the fact that the author of "The Golden Bough" drew a distinction between the true and the false in the supernatural order. He writes:

"Religion, according to Frazer, comes in a second stage of human

evolution. Frazer claims that there is a 'fundamental distinction and even opposition of principle between magic and religion.'

"The attempt to exclude magic from religion leads one into strange straits at the other end of our evolution. For Frazer actually defines religion so narrowly as to exclude that highest religious thought, that mysticism where belief has grown into confidence, and that theism which reverently but calmly faces omnipotence. The conciliation of higher powers by sacrifice and prayer represents only a part of religion.

"One cannot separate religion from magic by a mere definition. The further we examine the phenomena of religions the more we find them interpenetrated with strains of magic forces, and where our comparatively keen analysis fails to detect those elusive penetrations of varying grades of intensity and power, the primitive mind certainly never was able to distinguish them. The Romans had their college of augurers as well as their sacrificing priests; the augurers by their arts of divination made sure what sacrifice would be acceptable or adequate, and then the sacrificing priests fulfilled their demands. The joint operation, although it involved 'religious' action in the sacrifice, was an improved form of that compelling of 'the gods' which in primitive culture we term magic. Religious action is intelligible only upon the assumption that it will accomplish something. Whether it will accomplish all that is desired or not, the basis for the action remains substantially the same. It is only when religion, fertilized by thought, brings forth theologies that Frazer's contrast has a meaning."

Magic and sorcery and divination were commonly practiced in the religions of archaic paganism, and are so practiced still, in the East and in other places beyond the Christian pale. There have been those who pretended to speak as prophets. "I have seen folly in the prophets of Samaria; they prophesied in Baal and deceived my people, Israel," said the Lord, speaking through His prophet, Jeremiah. It appears to be Professor Shotwell's contention that the magical power wielded by these priests and prophets of Baal is the same power by means of which the ever-active miraculous power of God works in His Church, in the mystery of Transubstantiation, in the imparting of sacramental grace in baptism, the sacrament of Extreme Unction, the bestowal of the grace in Holy Orders. There can hardly be a doubt that this is the point which is intended to be made by this learned professor, for he proceeds to show that the very same power exists among savage peoples and is exercised for good or evil by their "medicine men." He illustrates this contention by pointing out the universality of what he calls "contagious magic," as beheld in the power of the mantle of the prophet Eliseus:

"It now transpires that savages the world over have gone farther in their analysis of their own actions than the Cambridge anthropologist. For even in about as primitive a state of culture as has yet been found, there is not only distinct recognition of this mysterious power behind contagion, but the savages have gone so far as to give it a name. It is *orenda* among the Hurons. The Aruntas of Australia call it *arungquiltha*, the Malgaches of Madagascar call it *hasina*, the Maoris *atua*, the Melanesians *mana*.

"We have no time here to take up the question as to whether this *mana* is behind all magic practices, or merely underlies those of contagion. . . . Its maleficent elements grows less and less apparent, and its beneficence more, until as divine grace, it nourishes the faith and strengthens the moral purpose of the Christian world. In the sacraments of the Church it still works by the old laws of sympathetic magic. In the realm of faith it has at last left the material media of its long prehistoric phase.

"One can see dimly now how much of the history of mankind in general and of Europe in particular, of social taboos and state jurisprudence, of marriage and inheritance, of power of priests and kings, rests directly for an explanation upon magic. The sacred and the holy are merely our equivalents for *mana* and *arungquiltha*. Moreover, if our surmises are correct, we have at last a consistent theory for the main line of religious evolution; and we reach the strange conclusion that the sacraments, as institutions which still definitely embody the earliest impulses toward religion, are older than God Himself—older, at least in that comparatively modern thing in this old universe, that reflex of actuality which we call the human consciousness."

In the proposition that "religious action is intelligible only upon the assumption that it will accomplish something," the learned professor furnishes a key to the line of argument as well as the ideal which he proposes to follow out. It is not the Christian concept of religion. True religion, in its essence, is the tie that subsists between God and His creature, man. Mutual love would have been, had man remained incorrupt, the fibre that formed the strands of that bond. Where love really exists, there can be no selfishness. Man should not desire anything beyond a continuance in the enjoyment of his Creator's love and guardianship, and God would ask nothing of man but his loving dependence upon His bounty and omnipotent power, for all eternity. The conception of religion which Professor Shotwell puts forward seems to be that which is embodied in the theory called Pragmatism—a system that tests religion by its practical results; a sort of materialism and cynicism combined.

For one thing, it cannot justly be complained that such a line of argument is lacking in boldness; nor yet can it be maintained that it is entirely and distinctly original with the present author. It is a portion of a long-drawn-out and often renewed attempt to show that Christianity is only a continuance of ancient paganism, and that its doctrines, sacraments and ritual are merely adaptations and modifications of the various features of the old pagan cult as it existed in Italy for centuries before the Christian era. This theory, again, is only a portion of a larger contention—namely, that there never was a Divine revelation, and that religion is nothing more or less than the outcome of a natural process of evolution.

We are brought back to the very beginnings of Christianity by such audacious attempts to confound its pure doctrines and noble practices with the foul and impious cult of ancient Rome upon which, to add to their repulsiveness in many features, were superimposed the worship of Mythra and the Egyptian orgies of Isis and the Epicurians. As far back as the days of Cyril and Tertullian, the Fathers of the Church were confronted with similar sophisms and were obliged to refute them publicly. St. Augustine denounced Faustus, the Manichean, for having stated that the Christians and the pagans had many practices in common. "Habemus quaeradum cum Gentibus communia, sed finem diversum," the great Doctor wrote. ("We have some things in common with the Gentiles, but we apply them to different ends.") The Christians, he went on to say, did not so much blame the pagans for sacrilegious rites, but because they offered sacrifices in honor of idols and demons. The Sacred Scriptures bristle with denunciations from God Himself, speaking through His prophets, of this awful sin of offering sacrifice to infernal deities—Moloch, Baal, Astarte, Dagon, and others of the Phoenician, Babylonian and Egyptian cult. Tertullian acknowledged that certain resemblances were to be found in the old and the new forms, and surmised, oddly, that it might have been part of the policy of the Arch-deceiver to copy the rites of the old in the new, that so he might lead men astray!

References to magic, sorcery and false prophets abound in the books of the Old Testament, and there are also some in the New; so that nobody can doubt as to the existence of some mysterious power for evil in all ages. Beelzebub, "Prince of Devils," we know from the Fourth Book of Kings, was worshiped in Accaron, where probably he had a temple or a shrine at which his deluded believers were wont to pray to him and ask his counsel as to going to war or remaining at peace. This Beelzebub is written of in such a way as to show that he was not merely an idol, but a real veritable evil spirit—one of the fallen angels. The incident of the four hundred

false prophets and Micheas, the single true one, as related in the Third Book of Kings, takes the reader up to heaven to show him how and for what purpose these false prophets were allowed to ply their maleficent trade—to lead the wickedly disposed into the just punishment of their designed and premeditated wickedness. To maintain that the Church makes use of this same magic in the ministration of the sacraments instituted by Christ, the Son of God, is, surely, blasphemy gone mad!

The sacred and the holy are merely the equivalents for "mana" and "arungquiltha." Mark the significance of this assertion. The two barbarous words quoted are described by the writer himself as conveying the meaning of "mysterious, wonderful, uncanny potency." "Our equivalents" for this uncanny thing are the holy sacraments that were instituted by our Divine Lord and Saviour for the purpose of preserving our immortal souls from the snares of their eternal enemy!

Then the conclusion that the sacraments "are older than God Himself," as the writer says, is certainly a strange conclusion. Analyzed, it means simply this: that God is nothing more or less than a creation of man's own imagination; in other words, that the creature has created his Creator, and is logically, therefore, greater than God, who creates only inferior beings. And now, when we have arrived at this definite conclusion regarding the origin of the God whom we adore, the question then comes up for solution: who created the wonderful animal, man, who is capable of creating even a God? "Hang up philosophy unless philosophy can make a Juliet," exclaims the frenzied lover, in the play. Hang up evolution unless it give us a logical answer to a plain requirement, say we. When you have eliminated God from the equation, what are you going to substitute? To tell us that "mana" and "arungquiltha" are the savage equivalents of the Christian sacraments and the illimitable power of God does not help in the slightest degree to unriddle this crux. It only proves that a Supreme Being is as necessary to a savage as to a blood-glutted French triumvirate and a howling horde of sans-culottes. It merely establishes the universality of the human conscience—one of the most irrefragable inductive evidences of the existence of the great benificent Being whom we know and love as God, the Creator and the Lord of all things, visible and invisible, created and yet to be created.

Seventy-five years ago Cardinal Wiseman, writing in the *Dublin Review*, found it incumbent on him to take up the challenge thrown out in letters in the *Times* newspaper written by a very shallow and unlearned Protestant named Poynder, on the very same topic, the identity of ancient paganism in regard to both beliefs and ritual,

with modern Catholicism. These letters were subsequently published in book form, under the title, "Popery in Alliance with Heathenism." Though the work did not really deserve serious discussion by scholarly men, because of its claptrap and shallow apologies for argument, the subject had been given such prominence by reason of its appearance in "The Thunderer," that the Cardinal was impelled to lay it on the dissecting table. He had not much difficulty in dealing with so puny an antagonist as Mr. Poynder. An archæologist, a classicist, a linguist, a hagiologist, the most erudite scholar of his day, he disposed of his fatuous antagonist with the ease and skill of a matador despatching a bull blinded with rage in the arena. Four letters he devoted to the subject. These letters are of inestimable value to the lovers of truth and the lovers of fine literature, for the light they throw upon many points obscure not only to non-Catholics, but to many Catholics as well.

For argument's sake the Cardinal admits that the Christians did transform some heathen temples into Christian churches, as in the most famous case—that of the Pantheon, in Rome. The neatness with which His Eminence turned his adversary's own arguments against himself is the most enjoyable feature of the great rejoinder. For instance, this passage regarding the transformation of the Pantheon:

"I will suppose, if you please, an ancient Roman revisiting that temple. The first thing which would strike him would be the sign of salvation—the image of Christ crucified, raised upon every altar—and most conspicuously upon the principal and central one. On the right, the picture of one whom men are stoning, while He, with eyes uplifted, prays for their conversion, would rivet his attention; and on the left, the modest statue of a Virgin, with an infant in her arms, would invite him to inquiry. Then he would see monuments of men, whose clasped or crossed hands express how they expired in the prayer of hope; the inscription on one side would tell him how the immortal Raphael had willed that no ornament should deck his tomb, but that very statue of God's mother which he had given to that church; another informs you, that the illustrious statesman (Consalvi), after bequeathing the fortune he had made in the service of the public, without reserve, to the propagation of Christianity among distant nations, would have no tomb; but that his friends had, as it were by stealth, erected to him that modest memorial. Around him he would see, at whatever hour of the day he might enter, solitary worshipers, who gently come in through the ever unclosed brazen portals, to keep watch, like the lamp which sheds its mild light upon them, before the altar of God. And I fancy it would be no difficult task, with these objects before us, to expound

and fully develop to him the Christian faith; the life of our Redeemer, beginning with His birth from a Virgin to His death upon a cross; the testimony to His doctrine, and the power which accompanied it, exhibited in the triumph of the first among His martyrs; the humble and modest virtue which His teaching inspired to His followers, their contempt of worldly praise, and the fixing of their hopes upon a better world; the constant and daily influence His religion exercises among its believers, whom it sweetly invites and draws to breathe a solitary prayer, amidst the turmoils of a busy life. And methinks this ancient heathen would have an idea of a religion immensely different from that which he had professed—the religion of the meek and of the humble, of the persecuted and the modest, of the devout and the chaste. . . . Julian the Apostate thus writes to the Christians: ‘You, oh hapless men! while you refuse to adore the shield descended from Jove’ (the ancile which you somewhere compare to a popish thing), ‘which the great Jupiter, or our father Mars, sent down, giving a pledge, not by words but by deeds, of sure protection to our city, adore the wood of the cross, signing its image on your foreheads, and sculpturing it on the front of your houses.’ You see, therefore, that Julian did not think that the substitution of our symbols for those of heathenism was any continuation of the same religion.”

Julian commenced his demurrer by accusing Christianity of being inconsistent. Although he began by complaining that the Christians had borrowed their doctrines and their ritual from pagan philosophers and Egyptian ceremonials, he wound up by declaring that the substitution of the symbolic cross for the “ancile” or shield of Jove (said to have been sent down from Olympus by Jupiter or Mars as a pledge of heaven’s protection for the city of Rome) was not any continuation of the same religion by any means, but rather the token of the effacement of the old in favor of the new. Cardinal Wiseman reminded Mr. Poynder that though he and other Protestants complained of the ancient Catholic practices on account of their having (as alleged) been borrowed from the old heathen ritual, they yet retained that ritual themselves in their baptismal ceremonial, their marriage formula, their vestments, their ordination forms, and various ecclesiastical usages and nomenclature.

Shifting his base of attack, the Cardinal took his antagonist into a new field. He invited him to accompany him into St. Paul’s Cathedral, in London, and look around and guess the religion which it represented. Does it represent any religion at all, or is it a place of worship, the visitor might be excused for asking. “No altar, no chapel, no emblem of any holy thought is visible; no point toward which men turn, as strongly concentrating the divine presence; no

emblem of a peculiar dedication; not a worshiper or a reverential spectator; not one who, as he crosses the threshold, prepares his soul, as if approaching God, in prayer. There he sees men with their heads covered as in the public street, walking to and fro, looking at the edifice only as an architectural wonder; while the gibe and the joke, or the state of the funds, or the scandal of the day alone divide with their well-taxed curiosity the conversation of the various throngs."

At no great distance from the hollow dome of English Protestantism rise the towers of an older and richer fane. It recalls the virtues of one of England's greatest saints, and the vaults hold the dust of some of her greatest kings and queens. Modern Philistinism has made it a Pantheon for modern heroes, while it graciously accords modern poets and prose genius a corner (Poets' Corner). The Cardinal invites his adversary to survey the monuments and ideals that speak from the halls and pillared recesses of this famous fabric:

"There he sees emblems indeed in sufficient number—not the cross nor the dove, nor the olive branch, as on the ancient tomb, but the drum and the trumpet, the boarding-pike and the cannon. Who are they whose attitudes and actions are deemed the fit ornaments for this religious temple? Men rushing forward with sword in hand, to animate their followers to the breach, or falling down while boarding the enemy's deck—heroes if you choose, benefactors to their country, but surely not the illustrators of religion. Of one it is said that he died as a Roman would certainly have wished him, after having grappled with his enemy's ship and rendered the destruction of one or both secure; the epitaph of another is expressed in the words of his commander's despatch; that of a third in the vote of the House of Commons; not a word of a single Christian virtue, not a hint that one professed or believed in any religion. And would not the heathen rejoice to have found a temple where the courage of the three hundred Fabii, or the self-devotion of the Decii, or the virtues of the Scipios were so plainly taught and held up to the practical admiration and imitation of men?

"And how would his delight increase, on more closely inspecting the emblems under which these virtues or their circumstances are expressed! Sea and river gods, with their oozy crowns and outpouring vases; the Ganges, with his fish and calabash; the Thames, with the genii of his confluent streams; and the Nile, with his idol, the Sphinx; Victory, winged and girt up as of old, placing earthly laurels on the brows of the falling; Fame, with its ancient trumpet, blasting forth their worldly merits; Clio, the offspring of Apollo, recording their history; and besides these, new creations of gods

and goddesses, Rebellion and Fraud, Valor and Sensibility; Britannia, the very copy of his own worshiped Roma; and some of these, too, with an unseemly lack of drapery more becoming an ancient than a modern temple. This assemblage of ancient deities, as the only symbols to instruct his eye, would as readily go to confirm him either that his ancient religion, its emblems and its morality, had never been supplanted or that they had lately been restored.””

When Christianity was at last free to come up from the vaults of the Catacombs it was unprovided with temples wherein to render thanks to God for the cessation of persecution. Paganism was dead, and the temples of the pagans were empty and abandoned. What more fitting than to wrest these from the dead hands of dead deities and, after lustration, rededicate the walls to the worship of the one true God? Such was the imperative need of the first few years of deliverance from force. But after a little while it grew upon the Catholic mind that it was more seemly that the worship of the Most High should have its own proper temples as well as its own priesthood and ritual. A decree of the Emperor Theodosius prohibited the further utilization of the fabrics or materials of the old pagan cult in the erection of Christian churches, and this speedily terminated the reign of makeshift in the realm of religious architecture.

If we admit, for the sake of argument, that man’s consciousness preceded the invention of God in that consciousness, with what a strange position are we confronted! Professor Shotwell holds that magic and religion are correlated, if not actually one and the same. Magic, identical with that of present-day Catholic religion, was, according to his theory, existent practically, under other forms, among aboriginal savage peoples, all over the known world in ancient times. If God had, as he postulates in this theory, a definite beginning at some unknown but conceded period, when, then, did the magic of the pagans have its birth, or was it a part of the spontaneous, self-creating thing or quality that belonged to the aboriginal race of mankind, but is by this school of “original research” denied to God—the God of Judaism and Christianity?

The obi man and the anointed priest of God stand on the same plane of respect for the awesome and the holy in the minds of the “illuminati” who sit in a place apart in the reserved gallery of Science, the place of the profound ones who never agree with the outsiders or even among themselves, but proudly exercise “the right of private judgment” about science as well as about religion.

The dilemma or *impasse* to which Professor Shotwell’s theories lead was recognized by at least one of his fellow professors who

listened to his argument, Professor Shridar V. Ketkar, of Cornell University. He commented, in part, in these terms:

"If I understand Professor Shotwell correctly, he disapproves of, if not disproves, Frazer's theory, which claims for magic precedence in time over religion. Frazer has held that man, with his brutal tendencies, first tried to command nature by his magic, and when he found nature too strong for him to control, he began to feel religious emotions. I am in full sympathy with the objections which professor Shotwell has to make to that theory. I have at least one source at my command which would show that the magical element in a religion became stronger and the devotional element became weaker in the course of time. 'The History of the Religion of the Hindus' supplies us with enough evidence to controvert the theory of Frazer.

"The literature which is considered as sacred and as final authority by the Hindus is called the Vedas. These Vedas are divided into two portions, Samhitas and Brahmanani. Of these two the former are the older and they are called Vedas in popular usage. The Vedas are four in number, and of these Règveda is the oldest and the Atharva Veda is the latest. One would find a strong devotional element in Règveda, and specially in those hymns which are connected with the god Veruna, which are considered to be the oldest hymns in that collection. Here one finds prayers to the deity to give the devotee health, strength, progeny, cattle, etc., earnest supplications to confer on the devotee a victory against the enemies, confessions of weakness, and supplications for forgiveness. But in Atharva Veda, which is a later literature, the devotional element is less marked and has a large portion given to magic."

It is evident, from a careful study of Professor Shotwell's phraseology on the subject that he had in his mind only the Catholic Church while seeking to establish between it and the occult powers a co-partnership in the trade of imposition on the minds of the credulous and superstitious. This undeclared purpose was palpable to the perception of another listener, Professor J. L. Gillin, of Iowa University. In his commentary he, unconsciously, no doubt, powerfully strengthened the retort of Cardinal Wiseman to Mr. Poynder, already referred to. He said:

"Not only in the Catholic Church has magic played a very important rôle, but even in our Protestant churches the same is true. Luther's protest was a breaking-away from the superstition that existed in connection with church ceremonials in his day, but how short-lived was that protest is shown by the fact that his followers, and the Protestant sects in general, soon reverted to the magical interpretations of Church rites and Church doctrines which he had

repudiated. Every succeeding edition of Melancthon's 'Loci Communes' becomes more retrogressive than its predecessor. Soon among the Protestants grace was conveyed to the infant by the waters of baptism, just as much as it had been in the Catholic Church. The communion bread and wine had magical power, just as it had had before Luther protested. Even pietism, protest of protests, together with a demand for return to the simplicity and earnestness of primitive Christian life, contained also a reversion to the magical ideas of Catholicism concerning ceremonials and rites. Many of these beliefs still persist. Almost numberless are the Protestants even to this day who to some extent believe in the magical power of ecclesiastical rite and ceremony, and of the ministration of consecrated hands."

Well, after a study of the whole field of controversy, what is the position now? Science is in the lead—at least, so it appears to think—and what has it to offer? It scorns and rejects both magic and religion, yet its professors are unable to agree whether religion is the gift of God or the invention of man, whether man was created by God or God is the creation of man's brain, whether magic existed before religion or religion before magic.

Some of the professors state flatly that magic and religion are identical. They do not offer any evidence—scientific, psychologic, or hermeneutic—to support this modest proposition; their *ipse dixit*, they appear to think, as good as the Quaker's affirmation in a court of law. They serve at least one useful function, when the weather is as intolerably exasperating as their own apologies for logical reasons for becoming infidels: they make us laugh when hardly anything else could do so.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

Philadelphia.

JOHN BLACK, SCOTTISH DOMINICAN MARTYR.

He's a man who dares to be
Firm for Truth when others flee.

THE appearance, last year, 1909, of Mr. W. Moir-Bryce's monumental work, "The Scottish Grey Friars," has naturally awakened the hope that the Scottish Black Friars may be the next to receive similar treatment at the hands of some equally fair-minded historian. If excellence can be gauged by popularity, and popularity by numbers, the Dominicans of pre-Reformation Scotland, with their twelve¹ houses, do not compare unfavorably with the Conventual and Observantine Franciscans, who possessed seven friaries and nine, respectively. But, apart from this question of merit, the histories of these two orders are so interwoven, and are in many respects of such similarity, that they obviously form fitting and natural companions. Nowadays, it is true, the interest taken in the life and work of the Poor Man of Assisi, not only by Catholics, but also by the cultured of every creed, has in great measure been extended to his sons. These are consequently viewed, at least here in England, by those outside the Church, in a much more favorable light than the brethren of the gloomy Inquisitors. However, it is surely a mere question of time before this diminution of prejudice as regards the Franciscans will naturally lead on to a fair hearing being given to and a just judgment being passed upon the sons of St. Dominic.

The Reformation in Scotland, looked at from the Catholic standpoint, presents a very sad picture, and this chiefly because, even among the religious orders, heroes were scarce. It was not that there were multitudes of bad religions, but that the staunch were very few. The Observantine Franciscans, for example, whose brethren in England had offered such a strenuous resistance to Henry VIII., all fled the land except two or three, who stayed behind only to fall away from the faith. More than half the Conventuals (there were but few of them) likewise yielded to the exigencies of the time and conformed. Of the Dominicans, who numbered certainly not more than two hundred, a few, including the provincial (an old man over seventy), apostatized; some twenty others gave way in so far as to become the recipients of pensions, while most of the rest who remained faithful probably took to flight. But not all of them; for there was at least one man (and others for that matter, into the details of whose history, however, I have not searched), a friar preacher and the subject of this paper, who did

¹ In 1510 they had eighteen houses, and some time before that date as many as twenty-two.

not seek a permanent refuge abroad—a man, indeed, worthy, if not of actual veneration, at least of the greatest admiration. For not only did he never really desert his country, but, animated with the purest zeal, he fought valiantly for the ancient faith and did battle in the cause of truth. At a time when the Church of Scotland was not overproductive of doctors, saints or martyrs, he stands out conspicuous (all the more so by the very contrast!) for his learning and heroism. If there be one name on the roll of Scottish Dominicans upon which all members of that order can look with pride, it is the name of Father John Black, the martyr.

I have divided this article into two parts. The first is a chronological account of the friar's life, and among other things the correct date of his death has been, it is hoped, finally established. Like other religious men of that stormy, and in Scotland almost barbarous time, Black has been the object of base and shameful accusations. Some of these have necessarily been introduced into the first part. Their refutation, however, must be deferred to Part II., in which the moral character of the friar will be placed under consideration and its integrity proved. In that part, also, Black's claim to the title of martyr will be discussed, and, I venture to think, sufficiently justified.

I.

SKETCH OF HIS LIFE.

Father John Black first comes to our notice in 1544, as a member already of some standing of the Dominican community at Aberdeen. For in that year, on August 24, counter actions for "strublance"² took place between him and one Marjory Gray.³ In 1547 the friars preachers of Aberdeen were engaged in a troublesome lawsuit, and on April 30 and May 23 Black was one of the two friars who appeared on behalf of the convent. The verdict, unhappily, seems to have been finally given against the friars.⁴ Father Black became procurator of the community before very long, for in that capacity he went to law in January, 1547-48, "against David Low and Janet Lesly, his wife, for an annual of 36s. from deceased Robert Endeaucht's land without Futeis port;"⁵ and in the March of the following year, "against John Litster for an annual of 10s. from

² *I. e.*, fraudulence (?).

³ Aberdeen Friars, Red, Black, White, Grey. Preliminary Calendar of Illustrative Documents, compiled by P. J. Anderson. (Aberdeen University Studies.) Aberdeen, 1909, p. 85.

⁴ The whole account of this interesting lawsuit may be read in the "Extracts From the Council Register of the Burgh of Aberdeen, 1398-1570." Aberdeen, Spalding Club, 1844, pp. 225 sqq.

⁵ "Aberdeen Friars," p. 87.

deceased Andrew Stevenson's land, on the west of the Gallowgait, now pertaining to Elspet Annand."⁶ Finally, on January 17, 1549-50, he was again in court as "collector and procurator" because Elspet Annand herself had neglected to pay the friars the annual rent (5 lib. Scots) of some other land; and he won his case.⁷ That he was procurator may be also seen from an account⁸ posthumous as regards Black, of a royal concession to Alexander Hay, in which the friar is referred to as having been once the owner of some land.

Friar Black may have been procurator till as late as 1556,⁹ and it was perhaps during these years that he wrote some of his works,¹⁰ for David Chalmers (Camerarius) says of him: "*Aberdoniae plurima pietatis et doctrinae argumenta [exhibuit].*"¹¹ Henceforth, however, Edinburgh seems to have become his headquarters. On September 27, 1558, William Ogilvy, Chamberlain of Murray (possibly James Stuart, Earl of Murray, afterwards Regent), promised in presence of the Lords of Council at Edinburgh "to content and pay to Friar John Black, preacher . . . the sum of £20 usual money of this realm within twenty days."¹² But the time of peace was fast drawing to a close, and a great storm of the Reformation soon burst upon the land. From the middle of 1559 to the middle of 1560 civil war raged in Scotland. The violent Reformers, having already burnt and pillaged many monasteries and religious houses in the provinces, succeeded in the beginning of July, 1559, in destroying or desecrating all the churches, including that of the Black Friars, in the capital itself. The tide of fortune, however, soon turned in favor of the Queen Regent and the Catholics. In August Mary of Lorrain, daughter of Claude, Duke of Guise, and mother of Mary Queen of Scots, came from Dunbar, and having reentered Edinburgh, took possession of Holyrood House. Friar Black, no doubt, attended her, unless, indeed, he had secretly remained in the city; for, as will be seen, he was her confessor. The following account, belonging to the period that now ensued, shows us something of the friar's work and of his reputation for learning: "Dureing this tyme, the Queene Regent maintained still the Masse in the Palace

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 88.

⁷ "Extracts From the Council Register," etc., p. 265.

⁸ "Registrum Magni Sigilli Regum Scotorum, 1546-1580," 10th February, 1574-1575, No. 2,360.

⁹ "Aberdeen Friars," p. 93.

¹⁰ His works were: (a) "De reali praesentia corporis Christi in sacramento altaris," lib. I.; (b) "Acta colloqui cum Willoxo symmista," lib. I.; (c) "Conclaves piae," lib. I.; (d) "Monitorium ad apostatas," lib. I. Cf. Tanner, "Bibl. Brit.," p. 104.

¹¹ "De Scotorum Fortitudine," Paris, 1631, p. 202.

¹² "The Exchequer Rolls of Scotland," XIX. (1557-1567); App. "Liber Responsionum," p. 428.

of Hallyrudhouse, wher the Papists resorted to her, and amongst the rest the Bishopp of S. Andrewes;¹³ who upon a day in this moneth of August, past to the pulpitt in the Abbay,¹⁴ shewing his commeing; and after he had vomited a little of his superstition, he declared that he had not bein weill exercised in that profession;¹⁵ therefore desyred the auditors to hold him excused. In the meantyme, he shewed unto them that there was a lerned man, meaning Fryer Blake, who wes to come immedately after him into the pulpit, who would declare unto them the trueth; and therefore desyred them to lett him cease."¹⁶

The author who has given us this information, writing of a few months later, after Edinburgh has been retaken by the Reformers and again abandoned by them, relates that in St. Giles' Church, which was purified in November, "the Papist Friars ceased not in their sermons to blasphemē and cry out against the trueth which had beene lately preached there" by the Reformers.¹⁷ This shows that, at least up to this date, Black was not the only Scottish friar who had forsaken neither fatherland nor faith. It was now that the English came to assist the Reformers. On the 7th of May, 1560, these allied forces attacked the stronghold of Leith, which was defended by the Scotch Catholics and the French. The following account is given by John Knox himself: "The Queen Regent sat at the time of the assault—which was both terrible and long—upon the forewall of the castle of Edinburgh, and when she perceived the overthrow of us, and that the ensigns of the French were again displayed upon the walls, she gave a gaff of laughter and said: 'Now will I go to the Mass and praise God for that which my eyes have seen,' and so was Friar Black ready for that purpose . . ."¹⁸ and said Mass for her presumably in St. Margaret's chapel. But Mary of Lorrain had long been ailing. Her health now gave way completely, and she died on June 10. During her last illness she had an interview with John Willock, whose name will appear again in this paper. That apostate friar¹⁹ was a prominent Reformer. And so much notice has been taken of this interview that no one, it seems, has left any record as to who performed the last rites of the

¹³ *I. e.*, Archbishop John Hamilton, successor of the celebrated Cardinal Beaton, who had been murdered on 29th May, 1546.

¹⁴ *I. e.*, Holyrood.

¹⁵ *I. e.*, of preaching.

¹⁶ "The Miscellany" of the Wodrow Society, 1844, p. 67.

¹⁷ *Ibid.* p. 73.

¹⁸ Knox, "History of the Reformation of Scotland," ed. 1831, p. 198.

¹⁹ Some historians say that Willock was an apostate Franciscan; others, following Leslie, assert that he had been a Dominican. It is a curious fact, however, that he is nowhere to be found mentioned as a member of either order.

Church for the dying Queen Regent. Friar John Black was most certainly her confessor at this time,²⁰ and so it will not, perhaps, be very rash to conjecture that it was he who administered the last sacraments.

Thomas Wood, who transcribed MS. W. of Knox's "History," has inserted a poem playing upon the friar's name, "because he was borne in the *Blak Freirs* in Edinburgh, and was a man of *Blak* personage, called *Blak* to his name, and one of the Ordour of *Blak Friers*."²¹ But a more complete version of this doggerel describing Mary Queen of Scots' "Black Chaplane," which bears the date 1636, is given by Calderwood. "This Frier Black," the few lines of introduction begin, "was Black in the threefold consideration; first in respect of his Order, for he was a Black Frier by profession; secondly in respect of his surname; thirdly in respect of his black works. Whereupon these black verses following were made as a black trumpet to blaze forth all his blackness:

"A certain Black Friar, weill surnamed Black,
And not nicknam'd, for black were all his workes,
In a black house borne, in all black deeds frack,
And of his blacke craft one of the blackest clerkes.
He took a black whoor to wash his black sarks,²²
Committing with her black fornication;
Black was his soule to shooe at such black markes;
Frier Black, Black Friar, Black was his vocation."²³

The foul charges against the Dominican apparent in these lines are of no value. They will be dealt with in Part II.

Some time during Cecil's visit to Edinburgh in 1560, that is between the 16th of June and the 20th of July, Friar John Black disputed with the Protestants in Holyrood Abbey. What the result was is not recorded. Randolph, Queen Elizabeth's ambassador in Scotland, is the only authority I have been able to find who makes mention of this affair at all. He does so in a despatch written three years afterwards, but unfortunately merely states the bare fact.²⁴ In the August of the following year, 1561, just before the arrival of Mary Queen of Scots in the kingdom, Black had, again at Edinburgh, a public disputation with John Willock, of whom mention has already been made. It was about the Holy Eucharist and the Sacrifice of the Mass, and the questions proposed were three in

²⁰ *Ibid* and "Calendar of State Papers, Foreign, 1562," No. 1,170.

²¹ Cf. "Works of John Knox," coll. and ed. by David Laing, 1848, Wodrow Society, Vol. II., App. p. 592, No. IV.; "Notices of John Black, a Dominican Friar," and Kirkton, "History of the Church," Edinburgh, 1817 (fourth), p. 10, n.

²² *I. e.*, shirts.

²³ Cf. David Laing, "Works of John Knox," *loc. cit.*

²⁴ "Calendar of State Papers Relating to Scotland and Mary Queen of Scots," ed. Bain, Vol. II., 1563-1569, No. 9, and *passim* for the dates of Cecil's letters from Edinburgh; also "Diurnal of Occurrents," Maitland Club, 1833, p. 59.

number: Quhether the naturall body of Christ was really in the sacrament of the altar, be vertue of the wordis spokin be the priest or no? Quhether in the sacrament efter the wordis of consecration, war any uther substance, than the substance of the body and bluid of Christ? Quhether in the Messe war a sacrifice propitiatorie for the sinnes of the kuicke and the deid?" The immediate results of this conference, which lasted two days, were not very satisfactory. Black, described as a learned man and a true defender of the Catholic doctrine, was unable to persuade Willock to abandon his heretical opinions. In the words of Leslie, who has given us this account, the friar "culd not bring Willox from defendeng his haeresie, nor culd turne him from his obstinacie." So the controversy, which was very keen and animated, ended where it had begun, and the common people "mekle mair doubted" and did not know which of the two disputants to side with.²⁵ From Chalmers²⁶ one would gather that Black was brought to Edinburgh as a prisoner (*raptus Edimburgum*), and that he overcame Willock in the dispute that followed. The latter statement sounds, at first, like the expression of an overzealous admirer; for this historian wrote some seventy years after the event, whereas Leslie, who states that in the disputation neither party secured the victory, was Black's contemporary. And yet to pass such a judgment would, I think, be hardly just; for the words of Chalmers are corroborated by those of other writers. The Jesuits in their "Report," which will be quoted at some length in Part II., declare that, even in the opinion of those only moderately versed in such matters (though very likely not in that of Leslie's "ruid people," or common people), the heretics were always defeated in discussions of this nature. Moreover, George Con,²⁷ in his account of this particular disputation, speaks of Willock as *egregie confusus*. And after all, the fact of Leslie's stating that neither party secured the victory is no real contradiction of this. For, as Con goes on to say, although Black quite outwitted Willock, the heretic refused to give in. And the explanation of this unsatisfactory state of things would seem to lie in the same historian's last observation. "Truly," he says, "what was the use of overcoming by argument men who undertook to carry all things through by sheer force of arms?"²⁸ It was a case of might against right. The apostate friar had the arms of the Reformers to rely upon, and it was quite impossible for Fr. John Black, at least on this occasion, to do anything more for the Catholic cause.

²⁵ Leslie, "History of Scotland," ed. Cody, O. S. B., 1889-1890, Part III., p. 455.

²⁶ "De Scot. Fort.," p. 202.

²⁷ "De duplicitate statuti religionis apud Scottos," Rome, 1628, Lib. II., p. 133.

²⁸ Verum quid profuit ratione viciisse eos, qui omnia aperta armorum vi peragenda suscepserant?"

A shameful episode must now be chronicled. In the spring of the year 1562 the Town Council of Edinburgh arrested and imprisoned Friar Black on the charge, though false (as will be shown in Part II.), of "manifest adultery." But the Queen herself soon came to his assistance. On April 11 she wrote to the Provost, Baillies, and Council of the city and commanded them to deliver Friar John Black to the keeper of the Castle of Edinburgh, to be kept there till he should be brought to trial.²⁹ This was no trivial favor, and in all probability saved the friar, innocent though he was, from a public disgrace and the ignominious chastisement of a ducking in the North Lock.³⁰ Whether the trial ever came off or not does not seem certain. The records of the criminal proceedings are silent, but from the fact that Black is next found in England, and on the authority of Randolph's statement that he was banished from Scotland, "being apprehended in advouterie,"³¹ it might be inferred that the trial did indeed take place. The value of the ambassador's evidence, however, will be considered in Part II., where, also, it will be shown that, even on the supposition that he *was* banished, not the slightest suspicion of guilt can fall upon the zealous Dominican.

And so, in the following November, whether as a banished subject or as a voluntary exile, Black was staying in the north of England. This appears from the following letter, which, being of some interest, I shall give in full as printed in the State Papers. It is from the Earl of Rutland and Sir Henry Percy to Cecil: -

"Percy being in familiar talk with him [Rutland], he said that he heard it reported that Sir James Crofts, Mr. Pawlet, and Mr. Stocks should go to serve at Newhaven.³² Sir Henry said that if what he heard lately was true, one of them was very unmeet to serve. He chanced to be at a gentleman's house where there was a priest, whose name he asked, who answered John Noyre; by which feigned French word and other marking he understood plainly what he was; for indeed he was Friar Black, confessor to the Scottish Queen Dowager. Talking of the journey of Leith,³³ Black told him that the Scottish Queen had from time to time true and perfect intelligence of all the proceedings and devices in the English camp, by one chief of the council there, named Sir James Crofts, who gave intelligence by the Laird of Blanern.—York, 2nd December, 1562;
signed H. Rutland; Henry Percy."³⁴

²⁹ Laing, *op. et loc. cit.*

³⁰ Cf. Maitland, "History of Edinburgh," p. 25, referred to by Laing.

³¹ "Cal. State Papers, Relat. to Scot. and Mary Queen of," ed. Bain, Vol. II., No. 9.

³² I. e., Havre-de-Grace, which had fallen into the hands of the English some two months previously.

³³ I. e., the siege in the spring of 1560.

³⁴ "Cal. State Papers, Foreign, 1562," No. 1,170.

It may be interesting to note in passing that this Sir Henry Percy's father, Sir Thomas Percy, was executed in 1537 for his share in the Pilgrimage of Grace; that his mother, Lady Percy, whose name will appear again below, was a very staunch Catholic; that his elder brother, Blessed Thomas Percy, Earl of Northumberland, was martyred for the faith in 1572, and yet that he was an occasionalist.

Friar Black must have returned to Scotland shortly after the letter just quoted was written; for he is supposed to have been stoned to death by a Protestant mob in Edinburgh on January 7, 1562-63. The statement to that effect, which has been generally accepted and believed, comes from Dempster and Chalmers.³⁵ But that these historians were, beyond any possible doubt, misinformed, is obvious, seeing that other records of the friar's life after this, and the real date of his death three years later, have been unerringly chronicled by contemporary writers. To show, however, for certain whence their mistake arose is no easy task. On the authority of Chalmers, it has been supposed that this violent assault upon Friar Black was connected with his disputation with Willock. Leslie, it is true, who gives by far the most complete account of that disputation, has left no record of any attack having been made upon the friar after its close, and Balfour, in his "Annals of Scotland"³⁶ (written under Charles II.), is likewise silent on that point. But this is easily explained by the fact that there was an interval of almost a year and a half between the conference and the assault. Besides, neither of these historians was writing a biography of Friar Black; indeed, the account of the disputation is the only piece of information that they give concerning him, and they do not record his death at all. And, of course, Leslie's history only goes down to the year 1562. Therefore, in my opinion, the most obvious conclusion to be arrived at is that, either as a later result of the disputation—possible on Black's publication of his "Acta colloquii cum Willoxio symmista"—or for some other similar reason, the friar was at this date set upon by his enemies, the Protestant Reformers, and nearly killed. He would not be the first man to have been stoned and taken for dead.

³⁵ Dempster, "Hist. Ecclesiast. Gentis Scot." (1627), Lib. II., n. 146, p. 85, who has been followed by Quetif and Echard, "Scriptores Ord. Praed.," ed. 1721, Vol. II., p. 182; Tanner, "Bibl. Brit.," p. 104; Hurter, S. J., "Nomenclator Literatus Theologiae Catholicae," ed. 3a, 1906, Tom. II., No. 671; Chalmers, "De Scot. Fort." (1631), p. 202 (who gives an alternate date for the Friar's death, viz., 15th December, 1562), who has been followed by "Collections for the Shire of Aberdeen and Banff" (Spalding Club, 1843), Vol. I., p. 202, and, together with Dempster, by James Grant, "Old and New Edinburgh" (1880-1882), Vol. II., p. 286; a writer in the *Rosary Magazine*, January, 1886; Mr. T. F. Henderson in the "Dictionary of National Biography" (New edition), Blak.; Mr. P. J. Anderson in his "Aberdeen Friars" (1909), p. 99. The last named writer has acknowledged his oversight and kindly corrected a mistake in my chronology.

³⁶ Vol. I., *ad ann.* 1561.

A few months later, May 19, 1563, Archbishop Hamilton and many other priests were tried at Edinburgh on the charge of hearing confessions and celebrating Mass. The performance of these actions was contrary to the law, and many of the accused, therefore, were thrown into prison. The Queen, it is true, obtained their liberation after a few months, but so hostile to Catholicism were the feelings of the party then in power that even this gentle interference gave the greatest offense to the Protestants. Randolph, writing to Cecil, says: "Many other priests summoned to a day to underly the law; seeing the good treatment of their marrows, take the nearest way over the water of Tweed, minding I am sure, to do no less mischief in England than they have done in Scotland. I am sorry so many Scots are received in our country: it will be the common refuge of papist offenders that cannot live here and are unworthy to live anywhere. One in special of whom your honour has heard, Friar Black, . . . is now with the Lady Percy, the old lady I mean [who was then living at her Ellingham estate in Northumberland⁸⁷], where he said Mass at Easter and ministered to as many as came. To verify this, I being at St. Andrews, my servant espied a fellow that said he came from England, and coming to 'my speache,' like a trusty servant for such a master, told me he served Friar Bläcke and had letters from him to the bishops of St. Andrews, Dunblane, Murraye, Lords Seton and Somervell, and divers others. I got such credit as to see the letters, and for a piece of money won the favour that he should return by me with the answers; as he did, and though there was little 'effecte' in one or other, I took copies of them, and delivered them to Murray 'as presentes sent unto me from the Borders.' I write this for the sure knowledge I have, by a servant of the friar's own, named, as his master is, John Bläcke, at this time with him within 4 miles of Newcastle; and within a mile of him there is another 'as honeste as he' that serveth a cure name [. . .]. There is also a notable famous friar 'the greatest lyer that ever was' (saving Friar Maltman alias Heborne, as he now calls himself); he dwells and sometimes preaches beside Hull. 'Yt muste neades be holesome doctrine that commethe owte of these mens mouthes! Savinge my charitie, I wolde thei were all hanged that gyve me occasion at thys tyme to troble your honour with so maynie wordes!' If it pleased you to warn the bishop of Durham, he would spy them out and cause them to return to their 'olde kynde a beggning' rather than 'welthylie' lie lurking in corners working mischief. . . . With your leave I will shortly write to the Bishop, and warn the wardens that such gallants be looked to, and convoyed

⁸⁷ Philipps, "Life of Blessed Thomas Percy," Catholic Truth Society, 1893, p. 8.

through the 'dayngers' of the Borders, if more come that way . . . Edinburgh. (*Signed*) Tho. Randolph."³⁸

Nothing seems to have been preserved concerning Fr. Black's career in the year 1564. Towards the end of 1565 friars were appointed to preach at Holyrood—an office they had not apparently fulfilled in public for seven years. It is not surprising to find that Black, once more in his own country, "was admitted for one of the Queen's chief preachers;" and at this time he "gave in a supplication for himself and his brethren to have a place erected for them."³⁹ Here again we see that there were still left in Scotland a few faithful friars. Another honor that our Dominican received (when, precisely, cannot be told), was his appointment by the Archbishop to the position of second master of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, a position that he retained until his death.⁴⁰

The last year of Fr. Black's life opened with an assault upon his person. On January 5, 1565-66, between eight and nine o'clock at night, in the "Cowgait" at Edinburgh, between "Nevyderis Wynd" and "Friar Wynd," the Dominican was suddenly set upon. He was given two or three blows with a cudgel, and was stabbed with a dagger between the shoulders "to the effusione of his blude." His chief assailants (most probably there were others as well) were four in number—namely, Andrew Armstrong, James Young, a cutler; William Johnston, a bow-maker, who also secured Black's cloak, and Thomas Brown, a shoemaker, all burgesses of Edinburgh; and their object was undoubtedly to kill him. Indeed, the wound in his back very nearly cost the poor friar his life, and Johnston's face was bespattered with his blood. Armstrong had been among the Reformers who forcibly objected to the celebration of Mass at Holyrood towards the close of the summer of 1563;⁴¹ and in this attack upon the friar he was probably the leader, and the other three men his hired ruffians. They were, of course, arrested and imprisoned.⁴²

Scarcely had the friar recovered from this shameful assault before he was again marked out, and this time slain. The tragic death of the famous David Riccio, Queen Mary's secretary, on the night of the 9th of March, 1565-66, was followed by a tumult at Holyrood, during which Fr. John Black was murdered in his bed. Bishop Parkhurst, of Norwich, one of those who record this dastardly deed,

³⁸ "Cal. State Papers Relat. to Scot.," etc., ed. Bain, Vol. II., No. 9.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, No. 358.

⁴⁰ "Register of Presentations and Benefices," Vol. I., fol. 25, quoted by Laing.

⁴¹ Calderwood, "History of the Kirk of Scotland," ed. 1842, Vol. I., p. 230.

⁴² Pitcairn, "Criminal Trials," Vol. I., pp. 475, 476, and "Cal. State Papers Relat. to Scot.," etc., ed. Bain, Vol. II., Nos. 358 and 359.

is unable, even at this juncture, to refrain from playing upon the friar's name. He says: "*Fraterculus quidam, nomine Blacke (niger, swartz), Papistarum antesignanus, eodem tempore in Aula occiditur.*"

"*Sic Niger hic Nebulo, nigra quoque morte permptus,
Invitus Nigrum subito descendit in Orcum.*"⁴³

Bedford and Randolph, in their letters to England a few days later, both record the murder of Black.⁴⁴ Bedford says he was slain at the same time as Riccio and "by like order." Randolph suggests that the perpetrators of the crime were some of the men who had endeavored to kill him two months before; but the proof that the friar died for the faith must be reserved for Part II. Lastly, Guzman de Silva, the Spanish ambassador in London, reports to King Philip II. the affair of the double murder of Queen Mary's secretary and of Friar Black, her "confessor." He also tells us that Queen Elizabeth had received a letter "saying they were killed at night."⁴⁵ So there can be no doubt whatever that March 9, 1565-66, is the correct date of Fr. Black's death.⁴⁶ As to his having been Queen Mary's confessor, this evidence is perhaps hardly sufficient to render the fact absolutely certain. At the same time, if the friar had been confessor to the Queen's mother, was afterwards one of Mary's "chief preachers," and was called in mockery, in the next century, the Queen's "Black Chaplane," it seems very probable—apart from the statement of Guzman de Silva—that he was also actually confessor to the Queen of Scots. And if critics would urge the absence of other authorities, it is easy to reply that all the other writers who might have recorded the fact were Protestants, and therefore not nearly so likely to advert to it as the Catholic Spanish ambassador.

⁴³ "Zurich Letters," Parker Society, 1842, p. 99.

⁴⁴ "Cal. State Papers Relat. to Scot.," etc., ed. Bain, Vol. II., Nos. 358, 359.

⁴⁵ "Spanish State Papers, Cal. of Letters, etc., Relating to English Affairs, Preserved at Simancas, 1558-1567," ed. Hume. *Ofl.* 23d March, 1566. On reference to this letter it will be seen that a man from Scotland said "that the confessor died the same night from natural causes." But as there are four or five first-hand authorities against him, this man must have been mistaken.

⁴⁶ Among modern writers, G. Chalmers ("Life of Mary Queen of Scots") and Bellesheim ("History of the Catholic Church in Scotland," translated by Hunter-Blair, O. S. B., Vol. III., p. 97) give this, without question, as the date of the Friar's death. Laing also (*op. cit.*), on the authority of Parkhurst's letter, shows that Dempster was mistaken in placing it in January, 1562-1563. But Laing himself falls into error when he says that Dempster quotes Leslie as his authority for that assertion, for Dempster (*op. cit.*) simply said: "Orthodoxae veritatis propugnator strenuissimus, intima eruditione praeditus, inquit Leslaeus;" and "De ejus constante professione Jo. Leslaeus lib. X., p. DLXXVII." Finally, M. Lecarpentier ("Le Catholicisme en Ecosse," Paris, 1905, p. 36) mentions as a single fact the assassination of Riccio and "d'un dominicain confident de Marie Stuart."

Thus did this courageous son of St. Dominic seal with his very lifeblood his constant profession of the faith. And so does he deserve a high place on the long list of the illustrious men of the Order of Preachers.

II.

HIS MORAL CHARACTER AND HIS CLAIM TO THE TITLE OF MARTYR.

He either fears his fate too much,
Or his deserts are small,
Who dares not put it to the touch,
To win or lose it all.
—The Marquis of Montrose.

Those who have had the patience to read the foregoing sketch of Fr. Black's life will now be prepared to face the slanderous accusations that have been made against him. His moral character has, indeed, suffered considerably at the hands of Randolph, Bedford, Knox and others. For the friar's enemies were very numerous, and whilst some of these more than once attacked his person and finally killed him, others as well did their best to sully his name with accusations of gross immorality. The present writer is now convinced that these scurrilous charges are entirely false. But let the reader, when he has considered both sides of the question, judge for himself.

What, then, are the evil deeds imputed to Fr. John Black? Sir Thomas Randolph, Queen Elizabeth's ambassador in Scotland at the time of which I write, appears as the first witness against him. In a letter dated June 3, 1563, after reminding Cecil of how Black had disputed with the Protestants at the time when that English minister was in Edinburgh, he says that this friar was "the self-same man that had hys leman taken with hym in the chapell of the Castle of Edinbourg, not longe before your comyng,"⁴⁷ that is, about the end of April or the beginning of May, 1560.⁴⁸ Nearly three years later, on March 13, 1565-66, reporting to Cecil the friar's death, Randolph again says of him: "This is he that was taken in the Castle Chapel with his woman; your honour knows the time."⁴⁹ John Knox, the illustrious Reformer, writing in the May of that same year (1566), likewise tells this story. For, after relating how Black said Mass for the Queen Regent on May 7, 1560, he goes on to say that this friar was the man whom the Regent "herself a little before had deprehended with his harlot in the chapel; but," he adds characteristically, "whoredom and idolatry"⁵⁰ agree well together,

⁴⁷ "Cal. State Papers Relat. to Scot.," etc., ed. Bain, Vol. II., No. 9.

⁴⁸ Cf. Knox, "History of the Reformation of Scotland," ed. 1831, p. 198.

⁴⁹ "Cal. State Papers," etc., ed. Bain, Vol. II., No. 359.

⁵⁰ I. e., Catholicism.

and that our court can witness this day, the 16th of May, 1566."⁵¹ Thomas Wood enlarges upon this narrative in verse,⁵² as also does the MS. volume of Calderwood's "History."⁵³

Secondly, in 1562, the Town Council of Edinburgh arrested and imprisoned Friar Black on the charge of "manifest adultery."⁵⁴ Randolph again reports this episode to Cecil twice,⁵⁵ and he tells him also that for this crime the Dominican was banished. In his second account (written four years after the event) he declares that the friar suffered this punishment for "*two several advouteries*," and this allusion to a second offense does not refer to the affair in the chapel in 1560, for of that also he has just before reminded his correspondent. In his first account, dated June 3, 1563—that is, one year after Black's arrest—he says: "I desire 'no nother' to Sir Henry Percy my good friend, but that his mother [with whom Black was then staying] might be warned to 'tayke heede to her maydes, for I assure your honour that frier is sycher knave; I desyre not that he leave in my countrie anye of the race.'"

Thirdly, Randolph testifies concerning Black that some time after Easter, 1563, "by his own confession made to my lord of Bedforde and to me, in this town [Berwick], he begotte a ladies woman with chylde, whear he served, not farre from Newcastle."⁵⁶ If the reader would obtain a true estimate of the tone of Randolph's correspondence, he should read the ambassador's letters in full. All that actually relates to Black, however, has been given above.

Fourthly and finally, the Earl of Bedford generalizes; for when reporting the friar's death he says that Black was "a ranke papiste and a man of evill lief."⁵⁷

These, then, are the accusations against Fr. Black. At first sight, indeed, they seem very grave and almost overwhelming. But remove the veil of prejudice through which every friar of bygone ages can but appear as a profligate and licentious man, view the charges in the clear light of twentieth century criticism, and one by one they will quickly disappear. The chief difficulty, of course, in refuting them lies in the fact that, though very definite, the accusations are extremely bare. I have given literally the sum total of all that is to be found against the friar, and really the matter hardly seems to lay itself open to direct disproof. The accusations are simply blunt assertions unaccompanied by any sort of explanation,

⁵¹ Knox, *op. et loc. cit.*

⁵² Kirkton, "History of the Church," Edinburgh, 1817, p. 10, n.

⁵³ Laing, "Works of John Knox," Wodrow Society, 1848, Vol. II., p. 592.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵⁵ "Cal. State Papers," etc., ed. Bain, Vol. II., Nos. 9, 359.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, No. 359.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, No. 358.

unsupported by any fair witnesses, unsubstantiated by any real or circumstantial evidence, proved by nothing. This fact, though perhaps going some way to show that they are groundless, has not facilitated their refutation. Nevertheless, it will now be my endeavor to prove that, taken as a whole or singly, the charges are utterly unworthy of belief.

Let us first of all consider them in general. It must be noted at the outset that all the accusations—even that of the Town Council (as will be shown in its proper place)—emanate from Black's adversaries. Now, assertions of opponents and enemies, uncorroborated elsewhere, can be of no weight. They would not obtain a hearing in a court of justice. Moreover, those who bring these charges against him display, as will be seen in each case, such personal hatred of the man, or such manifest prejudice against the religion of which he was a member, that they cannot on their own evidence be credited. They are utterly untrustworthy witnesses.

Again, in their "Report" to Clement VIII., the Jesuits expressly declare that the principal incentive to apostasy among the Scottish monks—and so among the religious in general—was "carnal liberty (one of the chief considerations of Calvin's gospel)."⁵⁸ If, therefore, Friar Black had really wanted to set at defiance the laws of the Church, and to ignore his religious vows, he, too, would have quickly "cast off the yoke of religion," and would not have suffered his priestly and monastic character to be the occasion of so much personal inconvenience, injury and peril. As Father Thurston has well said: "No sensual-minded ecclesiastic of the type depicted by Buchanan, that is to say, no man whose religious profession was a mere mask, would face opprobrium, exile and hardship when the way of apostasy was easy and provision secure."⁵⁹ Yet we know that Black suffered all these things and a great deal more. Surely, then, it is the plain calumny of his opponents to state that the friar was guilty of gross and even public immorality.

Moreover, all the Catholic historians who have written of him, as will be shown later, and also his accusers (except the Town Council, which, as will be seen, had its reasons for not doing so) assert or imply that the friar was a staunch Catholic. It is not as though he was simply styled or supposed to be a Catholic. On the contrary, his activity in religious matters is most pronounced, and really seems to give the lie to the accusations of immorality, seeing that the law

⁵⁸ "Report Upon the State of Scotland During the Reign of Queen Mary" (written not later than 1594, and sent to Pope Clement VIII.), by the Jesuit Priests of Scotland, translated from the early Latin copy in the Barberini MS. XXXIII, 210 (1197), quoted in "Memoirs of Mary Queen of Scots" (by Claude Nau), edited by Joseph Stevenson, S. J., 1883. App. I.

⁵⁹ *The Month*, December, 1909, pp. 611, 612.

of celibacy for the clergy is such a marked characteristic of the Catholic Church. A profligate priest is certainly not an example of a good Catholic.

And there is another point to which attention must be called. John Law,⁶⁰ sub-prior of the Dominicans of Glasgow, recanted and received the usual pension; John Douglas left the Carmelites, and became one of Knox's most valued coöoperators; John Willock, another apostate friar whom we have met before, was advanced to positions of the highest trust; John Black, on the other hand, who remained firm in his allegiance to and very strenuous in his defense of the Catholic Church, was made the object of the gravest accusations. "As in England, this last mentioned circumstance," says the well-known critic already quoted, "throws a flood of light upon the sincerity of Reformers' denunciation of the friars. As long as these religious remained true to the faith in which they had been born and in which they had bound themselves by solemn vow, they were continually satirized by their opponents as both dissolute and ignorant. The moment that they yielded to pressure and were content to renounce their allegiance to Rome, they suddenly became men worthy of all respect for their learning and probity, while not the slightest scruple was manifested about advancing them to responsible cures in the religious system to which they conformed."⁶¹ Fr. Black was always a staunch Catholic priest and a whole-hearted Dominican, and he displayed the most remarkable zeal and energy in the cause of the ancient faith. This was the reason why he was attacked and stoned, cudgeled and stabbed; why he was twice driven into exile; why he was finally murdered, and this also, we may be sure, was the reason why he was so shamefully and so falsely calumniated by his opponents.

Further, if Fr. John Black was publicly known to be a man of evil life, would he have been confessor to Mary of Lorrain? Would she have had him to say Mass for her if, as John Knox asserts, she had herself found out but a few days before that he was really a profligate man? The Queen Dowager was not, perhaps, a saint, but no one who has read the history of her life could honestly answer these questions in the affirmative. Again, when in 1562 the friar was thrown into prison on the charge of adultery, Mary Queen of Scots came to his aid and ordered his removal to the Castle, as though to show that she at least knew that he was innocent. But

⁶⁰ The case of John Law is not so clear as either of the other two I have chosen, for it raises the difficult question: Does a pension mean apostasy? Law himself, together with his prior, had under Queen Mary's seal (April, 1567) an annual rent from their own gardens and priory in Glasgow, and several others obtained annuities from their own property.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 612.

further, is it conceivable that this Queen would have chosen for her very confessor, or even for one of her special preachers, a religious really guilty of this and other crimes and therefore so utterly unworthy of her confidence? Would such a man have been tolerated, much less allowed to say Mass and administer the sacraments, in the house of such a loyal and dauntless Catholic as Lady Percy? Is it possible that Fr. Black, with these stains upon his name, would have been promoted to, or even have continued to hold the position of second master of St. Mary's College? Archbishop Hamilton, though not faultless, would never, I think, have allowed that. He himself had endowed the college, as the foundation charter tells us, "for defending and confirming the Catholic faith, that the Christian religion might flourish, the Word of God be more abundantly sown in the hearts of the faithful, and to oppose the heresies and schisms of the pestiferous heresiarchs who, alas! have sprung up and flourished in these times, in this as well as in other parts of the world."⁶² It is not likely, then, that he would have let Black retain his master's office if the friar had been a worthless character. Finally, it must be noted that Guzman de Silva, the Spanish ambassador in London, does not mention anything about the scandal of Black's private life, not even as reported. And this is remarkable in that the ambassador was a Catholic, the one Catholic who records Black's death. It looks as though he had never heard anything about it; or, if he had, did not consider the information worthy of repetition, much less of belief. But what is yet more surprising is that Parkhurst, the Protestant Bishop of Norwich, is likewise silent on this subject. Now, if the friar, whom the Bishop scornfully styles *Fraterculus*, had been really a notoriously bad man, as Randolph and Bedford assert, Parkhurst, who knew all about Black's murder, would surely have been aware of this fact also, and have made the most of such a salient point; but, as has been seen, he simply makes a joke about the friar's name.

Let us now proceed to consider the accusations in particular, that is, individually. The first, then, comes from Thomas Randolph, who says that the friar "was taken in the Castle Chapel with his woman." Now, this charge, as has been already noticed, was reiterated by Knox. Moreover, Thomas Wood and another writer found the theme to be sufficiently exalted for poetry. Of these last rather unnecessary additions to English verse no refutation is needed; they are simply the amplifications of a later age, and may be compared to fungi sprouting from some rotten roots. But concerning Knox a word or two must be said. Although his account of this affair did not appear in black and white till 1566, when his

⁶² Cf. C. J. Lyon, "History of St. Andrews," ed. 1843, Vol. I., pp. 316, 317.

"History" was published, he surely made the accusation orally long before that date. It is possible that he was even first in the field. Now the Sacrament of Penance has frequently been the subject of foul, but false insinuations. Is it not likely, then, that this malevolent Reformer should have seized just some such opportunity as this would have afforded to spread about the report of the heinous crime of his hated opponent, Friar Black—hated for his loyalty to the Catholic faith? This suggestion is, of course, pure conjecture, but it is offered in the light of what is quite certain—namely, that Knox's animosity made him relate many a ridiculous falsehood concerning his enemies, and that his anecdotes about them, as historians are agreed, are utterly unworthy of belief. "Nothing is more objectionable in Knox's behavior," says a fair-minded writer, "than his practice of speaking evil of [even] the highest dignities both of Church and State, simply because they were of a different creed from his own." And again: "He seemed to try how much he could outdo others in vulgar wit and coarse invective. All who have read his writings will at once admit this."⁶³ There was no love lost between him and the friars; so what he has said detrimental to Black's good name can count for nothing. It has been dismissed by Mr. James Grant, who says on the other hand that the Dominican "was a learned and subtle doctor, a man of deep theological research."⁶⁴ So much then for Knox. As to Randolph, the best refutation of the charge as coming from him is to be derived from evidence with which he himself supplies us. For he states that two, or at most three, months after the affair in the chapel Black had a disputation with the Protestants in Holyrood Abbey. Now, it is quite ridiculous to suppose that, in the case of his guilt, the friar would have been so audacious, so brazen as to defend the Catholic cause against men who would at once have thrown in his face the taunt of his flagrant immorality. Indeed, the courage displayed by Fr. Black in publicly disputing with the Protestants at that time, and on a subsequent occasion with Willock in particular, can only be explained on the supposition of his complete innocence as to this first accusation.

The next charge is that of the Town Council, who arrested Fr. Black for adultery. To those unacquainted with the history of the time, this fact, at first sight at least, will seem to weigh heavily against the friar. And yet, what was easier for his enemies than to accuse him falsely? Moreover, it must be borne in mind that all,

⁶³ C. J. Lyon, "History of St. Andrews," Vol. I., p. 348.

⁶⁴ "Old and New Edinburgh," 1880-1882, Vol. II., p. 286. Cf. also his "Memorials of the Castle of Edinburgh," 1850, pp. 91-93. On p. 92 of the "Memorials" the date 1560, in the quotation from Knox, is a misprint for 1566.

or nearly all, official positions in Edinburgh were at that date (1562) in the hands of the violent and bigoted Reformers. And so, if it was easy to accuse the friar, it was likewise not difficult to procure, either by help of accomplices among the already prejudiced jury or else by means of actual perjury, his condemnation. And lest the reader should think that I make too light of this charge or that I have not truly represented the state of things in those troubled times, let me give a sample of this same Council's work in the year preceding Black's arrest. In 1561 the provost and two bailies of Edinburgh made "a proclamation 'that no adulterer, fornicator, druncard, massemonger or obstinat papist' should be found within the walls, after forty-eight hours, under penalty of being branded on the cheek and carted through the streets."⁶⁵ This offensive classification clearly shows how Catholics and adulterers were ranked together, and how in the eyes of the Reformers and of the law these words were all but synonymous. It also shows that, as was said above, even the Town Council is to be placed on the list of Black's adversaries. The friar was certainly a "massemonger" and an "obstinat papist." Will it not then be reasonable to infer that the accusation of adultery was brought against him simply because it was judged to be, specially in his case as he was a particular friend of the Queen, the one best calculated to secure his condemnation? At all events, I trust sufficient has been said to show that, even if he was condemned, not the slightest proof can be adduced therefrom that he was really guilty of the crime alleged. But it is not at all certain that he was condemned. Indeed, we do not even know whether the trial was ever held or not. Randolph is the only authority who says that Black was literally banished. This the ambassador tells us on two different occasions, just as he did in the case of the affair in the chapel in 1560; but, with due respect to him, I am of opinion that the chief merit of these repetitions is that they establish beyond doubt the identity of Fr. John Black. For in this case he states, on the first occasion, that the friar was banished for "advouterie" simply; on the second, apparently forgetting this, that Black received this punishment for "two severall advouteries," of which double crime, or rather accusation, there is not the slightest intimation elsewhere. However, of Randolph's character and of the value of his evidence I shall speak in the next paragraph. But the fact that he clearly exaggerates the number of the charges made against the friar is in itself more than suspicious, and throws considerable doubt upon the sincerity of his accusations taken as a whole, and upon the veracity of his particular statement about the banishment. To

⁶⁵ James Grant, "Memorials," etc., notes, p. 289, quoting Calderwood's "Historie." The italics are mine.

explain the fact of Black's being in England not long after his arrest and the time when the ambassador said he was expelled from the kingdom, is easy. It is quite within the bounds of reason to suppose that the Queen (after having rescued him from the Town Council) advised him, in order to appease his enemies, perhaps even for his safety's sake, helped him to quit the land. It is also worthy of notice that only eight or nine months after his arrest Fr. Black was again north of the Tweed.

The third accusation against the friar comes, like the first, from Thomas Randolph. In a despatch to Cecil dated March 13, 1565-66, he says of Black that some time after Easter, 1563, "by his own confession made to my lord of Bedforde and to me in this towne [Berwick], he begotte a ladies woman with chylde, whear he served not farre from Newcastle."⁶⁶ To form some idea of the value of this information, let us first of all go to another of the ambassador's letters. Writing in 1563 he relates that Black was staying with Lady Percy, "wheare he saide masse at Easter, and ministerde to as maynie as came."⁶⁷ Now, Lady Percy was at that time living on her Ellingham estate in Northumberland.⁶⁸ So when Randolph states, in the other despatch, that not long after this the friar sinned with a lady's maid "whear he served not farre from Newcastle," he obviously means Ellingham. Now, in his first letter, that of 1563, after expressing a wish that such men as Black "were all hanged," (!) he says: "I desire 'no nother' to Sir Henry Percy my good friend, but that his mother might be warned to tayke heede to her maydes, for I assure your honour [Cecil] that frier is sycher knave: I desyer not that he leave in my countrie anye of the race."⁶⁹ Then, in his second letter, that of 1566, he tells us that Black did precisely as he had foreseen and seduced a lady's maid. Now, all this is very odd. The ambassador seems to have had an exceedingly accurate foreknowledge of all the evil that Friar Black would do. Or was it that he knew what, when occasion offered, he would say Friar Black had done? On the face of things it is absurd to suppose that Lady Percy would have had such a despicable man in her house, and still more ridiculous to allow that Fr. Black, if guilty of this crime, would have been at pains to say Mass and administer the sacraments, yes, and have been in exile at that very time for having said Mass and given the sacraments in Scotland,⁷⁰ when he had only to give up these things and the practice and belief of his religion to be left alone and permitted to act as he liked. And

⁶⁶ "Cal. State Papers," etc., ed. Bain, Vol. II, No. 359.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, No. 9.

⁶⁸ Philipps, "Life of Blessed Thomas Percy," Cath. Truth Soc., 1898, p. 8.

⁶⁹ "Cal. State Papers," etc., ed. Bain, Vol. II, No. 9.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

then as to Randolph's statement of the friar's confession at Berwick of his own guilt—the whole thing is utterly preposterous. Why, that would have been hardly less extraordinary than voluntarily signing his own death warrant. Besides, we must remember what sort of man was this ambassador. Tytler,⁷¹ that rigid Calvinist, says of him that he sent the most false and distorted accounts of the state of Scotland to Cecil and Elizabeth; that, to gain the end he had in view, he not only concealed the truth, but did not scruple to employ calumny and falsehood. With political and religious changes, the tone of his correspondence undergoes a proportionate alteration. For instance, as Lingard has remarked, it is quite amusing to notice that as long as the Queen acted under the guidance of Murray, Randolph's letters are full of Mary's praise, but that the moment Murray became opposed to her, that is in 1565, the ambassador is teeming with dark insinuations and even open charges to the prejudice of the Queen. Moreover, he sometimes wrote for the benefit of other readers besides Sir William Cecil or his royal mistress. Thus not seldom his letters were composed to tickle the ears of the ladies at the English court. It is apparent that he delights in relating and repeating any savory bit of gossip, and that he is quite capable of amplifying and even inventing an account of some edifying scandal. At the very time he composed the last story about Black, whom he hated for being a Catholic and a Dominican, Sir Thomas Randolph was in banishment from Scotland. For in February, 1565-66, Queen Mary had ordered him to quit the court, as a person convicted of abusing the privileges and violating the duties of his office as an ambassador.⁷² This man, then, is Fr. Black's chief accuser—may we not rather call him the friar's worst calumniator?

Lastly, the Earl of Bedford, that great supporter of the Protestant cause and faithful servant of Elizabeth, accuses Black of having been "a ranke papiste and a man of evill lief." But *quod gratis asseritur gratis negatur*. Bedford was a man of such a very different stamp from Fr. John Black, that one almost unconsciously shrinks from accepting his unqualified condemnation of the friar. Perhaps he derived his information on this point from Randolph; they were together in Berwick at the time, and their letters to Cecil, in which they speak of Black, were both written on the same day, March 13, 1565-66.⁷³ Moreover, in the same breath in which he says that the friar was a man of evil life, he also declares that he was a rank Papist. Now this almost amounts to a contradiction in terms. If he had simply said Papist, the assertion that Black was a bad

⁷¹ "History of Scotland," ed. 1873, Vol. III., pp. 205, 206.

⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 215, 216.

⁷³ "Cal. State Papers," etc., ed. Bain, Vol. II., Nos. 358, 359.

man might at least have been credible. But the epithet rank, superlative in meaning if not in grammar, demonstrates clearly that the friar was a Papist among the Papists, that he was ultra-Catholic. Surely, then, there is not room here for immorality.

As coming from his enemies, none of these accusations can affect the reputation of Friar Black. It seems to have been a common resource in those days to cast aspersions and scandalous charges at one's opponent, to drag his name in the mire. Witness the examples of Cardinal Beaton a few years earlier, and of Mary Queen of Scots a little later, both grossly slandered by their enemies, and both by their friends as strenuously defended.

Up to this point I have endeavored to refute the calumnies directly. But there is also an indirect proof of Friar Black's innocence. If we can show that Black was a man of exemplary life, it will be quite obvious that his morals must have been absolutely unimpeachable. Now, fortunately for the friar's reputation, this has been asserted, or at least implied, by all the Catholic historians who mention his name. Dempster (1628) styles him *praeclarus Christi miles, ac invictus religionis Catholicae pancratista*, and the like;⁷⁴ George Con (1628) simply *ex D. Dominici familia*,⁷⁵ as though Black's having remained a Dominican in those trying times was quite sufficient recommendation; Chalmers (1631) actually calls him *Beatus Joannes Blak*.⁷⁶ It is true that the first and last, the most emphatic of these writers, made a mistake as to the date of the friar's death, but surely this does not mean that they are to be considered untrustworthy on every other point. But even if this were so, it would hardly matter, because, happily, Black's character is independent of the eulogies of these historians. Leslie, the famous Bishop of Ross, who wrote his history only three or four years⁷⁷ after the friar's death, says he was a most strenuous champion of the orthodox faith and also a man of the deepest learning.⁷⁸ Moreover, the Jesuits in their "Report" referred to above, record (not

⁷⁴ "Hist. ecclesiast. Gent. Scot. Bononiae," Lib. II., N. 146, p. 85.

⁷⁵ "De duplice statu religionis apud Scotos," Romae, Lib. II., p. 133.

⁷⁶ "De Scot. Fort.," Parisiis, p. 202.

⁷⁷ Leslie's "History of Scotland" from 1436 to 1562 was written between 1568 and 1570, in part in the Scottish language. It remained unpublished till 1830, when it was printed by the Bannatyne Club. The Latin edition of the history, entitled "De Origine, Moribus, et Rebus Gestis Scotorum," extending from the earliest times down to 1562, was published in Rome in 1578. A Scottish translation of this edition was made by Father James Dalrymple, O. S. B., in 1596, which in 1889-1890 found an able editor in Father E. G. Cody, O. S. B. Leslie left in manuscript a meagre narrative of events from 1562 to 1571, an English translation of which is published in "Forbes-Leith's Narrative of Scottish Catholics" (1885), but it contains no information concerning Friar Black.

⁷⁸ "De Origine, Moribus, et Rebus Gestis Scotorum," Romae, 1578, p. 577.

later than 1594) that Sir John Black, as they call him, and certain other "Catholic preachers came forward who not only refuted the errors of the heretics with great spirit from the pulpit, *but also kept the people to their duty when they were dropping away*; and this they did by the publication of many works in the Scottish language." A little further on the account continues: "At this time there was in Scotland a considerable number of scholars, well versed not only in scholastic theology, but in the works of the fathers, and indeed, in every department of antiquity. These men held frequent public disputations with the heretical ministers, especially in the celebrated University of Aberdeen and in Edinburgh, which is the abode of royalty. *By this means many persons were kept safe in the Catholic faith*; for, even in the opinion of persons who were only moderately versed in such matters, the heretics were always defeated in discussions of this nature. It was impossible that a better mode of proceeding could be followed at a time when everything was done by violence and arms."⁷⁹ The reader will allow that not many persons would have been "kept safe in the Catholic faith," nor have been saved from "dropping away" by a priest who was a public sinner.

This brings us to the last argument. Had John Black been a man of evil life, he could never have preserved intact, as he did, his great and good reputation among the Catholics of Scotland. At the time of his death he was styled by a Protestant Bishop *Papistarum antisignanus*,⁸⁰ that is, held in great estimation among the Papists. Now, considering that at this period the Catholics had shrunk to a feeble minority, that the wheat and the chaff had been separated, that it was in fact a case no longer of degenerated quantity, but of surviving quality, it will be allowed that this argument of the opinion of Black's Catholic contemporaries is of considerable value.

The testimony of the old Catholic writers has been given, and I think that they are far more worthy of credence on such a subject as the morals of Friar Black than Randolph, Bedford and the infamous Knox, and that the statements of the former much more than neutralize those of the latter. Not only Catholics, but all recent writers, have followed in their steps and carried on the tradition of the integrity of Black's character. Let me sum up with the words of one who was fully acquainted⁸¹ with the slanderous accusations made against the Dominican. Friar Black, says Bellesheim, was "an exemplary priest and a staunch upholder of the ancient faith."⁸²

⁷⁹ "Report," etc., App. I. The Italics are mine.

⁸⁰ "Zurich Letters," Parker Society, 1842, p. 99.

⁸¹ He constantly refers to the "State Papers," among which are the letters containing the calumnies against Black.

⁸² "History of the Catholic Church in Scotland," trans. by Hunter-Blair, O. S. B., Vol. III., p. 97.

The question of Black's claim to the title of martyr now remains to be dealt with. Dempster, Chalmers, Quetif and Echard and Hurter, in fact, speaking generally, all those who, on the authority of the first two named, place the friar's death in 1563, state that he suffered martyrdom. But seeing that the friar was not killed at all in that year, the testimony of these writers on this particular point may perhaps be considered of little value. Nevertheless, a conclusion almost identical with theirs may be drawn from other and contemporary records. I use the word *almost* because it cannot, indeed, be held as absolutely certain that Black was a martyr, for the simple reason that the fact cannot be absolutely demonstrated. But that this may be safely and legitimately inferred, and so be considered as morally certain, I shall now endeavor to show.

As has been said, two old historians, Dempster and Chalmers, who have been generally followed by more recent writers, state that Friar Black was attacked and killed by the Reformers in January, 1562-63. Black, however, as we have seen, was not actually killed then. But we know that he strenuously opposed the Protestants; he had been doing so all his life, both by word of mouth and by his pen. Moreover, his moral victory over Willock and the publication of his controversy with that apostate must have deeply offended the Reformers. I have therefore come to the conclusion that Black was indeed attacked by the Reformers at the time when Dempster and Chalmers say he was killed, and that he was so severely injured that he was taken for dead.⁸³ Secondly, three years after this assault almost to a day—namely, January 6, 1565-66—the friar was again set upon and all but slain, and once more his assailants were the Reformers.⁸⁴ Finally, on March 9 of this same year (1565-66), in the tumult that followed Riccio's murder, Friar Black was attacked for the third time and at last killed.⁸⁵ But by whom, and why? Randolph, after recording the friar's death, refers to the assault made upon him by the Reformers in the previous January and to the number of persons imprisoned on that account, and then adds the significant clause: "Perchance some of them [were] the authors of his end."⁸⁶ This suggestion is all the more noticeable in that the names of "John Knox and John Craig, preachers,"⁸⁷ are on the first official list of those implicated in the murder of Riccio.⁸⁸ And when, lastly, it is remembered that the tumult at Holyrood, during which

⁸³ Cf. Part I.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*

⁸⁶ "Cal. State Papers," etc., ed. Bain, Vol. II., No. 359.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, No. 363.

⁸⁸ Tytler maintains ("History of Scotland," Vol. III., pp. 403-409) that this is unquestionably the true and correct list, because intended for Cecil's eye alone.

the friar was slain, was created by the Reformers,⁸⁹ the conclusion is irresistible that it was the Reformers who killed him. They had tried to kill him before, and had failed. But catching him now quite defenseless, they succeeded.

And now, why was he murdered? Bedford says that Black was killed at the same time as Riccio and "by like order."⁹⁰ This may be true. But whereas there may be found in the letters printed in the State Papers manifest hints of the intended murder of Riccio, there are none with regard to the friar. Nor is there any more information to be found in the letters (or Knox's "History") written after his death. The Reformers, it seems, who could not speak of Fr. Black without abusing and maligning him, were not generous enough to supply us with details concerning his untimely end. But we know that Knox and Craig and their party were endeavoring to extirpate the Romish idolatry, and that they held that idolatry was punishable by deah.⁹¹ We know that they had a special grudge against this Dominican for having dared to oppose their champion, Willock, and that he was a constant stumbling-block in their way. His inexhaustible zeal and energy on behalf of the ancient faith was his one offense. This it was that had made the Reformers his enemies, and—the conclusion is natural—this it was that occasioned his violent death. Therefore, I think, it may be considered as morally certain that Friar Black was a martyr.

Fr. John Black was rightly called *praeclarus Christi miles*; for in an age of bitter religious warfare, he died, as he had lived, an invincible champion of Catholicism.

R. P. DEVAS, O. P.

Rugeley, England.

⁸⁹ Tytler, "History of Scotland," Vol. III., pp. 216-220.

⁹⁰ "Cal. State Papers," etc., ed. Bain, Vol. II., No. 358.

⁹¹ Cf. Tytler, III., pp. 216 and 407.

IRISH CATHOLICS UNDER CHARLES II.¹—II.

ON the 1st of July, 1666, Ormond wrote again to Arlington,² giving him further information concerning the proceedings of the Catholic Convention. His letter was sent from Dublin Castle, and was in part as follows:

"Since mine of the 27th, in which I sent an extract of my letter to the Lord Chancellor, I have received yours of the 26th with the copy of a letter from Vlissingen. I thank you for both, and pray the continuance of such intelligence as you think it proper for me to have at this conjuncture. I have put the remonstrances of the Romish clergy into the hands of those who will know how far they fall short of those which have already been presented to the King of England. They have not, however, yet brought me their observations. I took this way so that the King, when he receives an advice on the whole matter from the Council here, with suggestions as to how the Roman Catholics here should be proceeded with, may be more ready to declare his pleasure therein. I have given those to whom I have referred it plenty of time, so that as this document is to be the test of favor to the signers or of prosecution of the refusers, it may be so carefully and clearly considered and exposed to the world as to justify both; yet I hope before I leave this place, I shall be able to transmit the state of the matter and our humble advice upon it."

On the 12th of the same month Robert Leigh, who was agent for Arlington in Ireland and looked after his estates and other concerns, wrote a letter to one Joseph Williamson, another subordinate of the Secretary of State, which shows pretty plainly how justice could be bought and sold at the time when the missive was penned. This, as epitomized by Mr. Mahaffy, ran thus:

"A person of honest reputation here and in daily use in the King's service fell some time since into a piece of unlucky trouble, and, not

¹ *Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1666-1669*, edited by Robert Pentland Mahaffy, London, His Majesty's Stationery Office.

² Henry Bennett, Earl of Arlington, born in 1618, had a distinguished career as a student of Christ Church College, Oxford. During the Civil War he proved himself not only a brave soldier, but an extremely capable statesman. When the royal cause seemed lost, he sought refuge in France, when he returned to England at the Restoration, where he proved himself the wisest of the advisers of Charles II., and his counsels were highly approved by the Duke of York, afterwards James II. For a considerable time he held the post of Ambassador to the Spanish Court, where he was in high repute. When James ascended the throne he strongly disapproved his efforts to impose Catholicism by force on England. He died July 28, 1685, aged sixty-seven, and is asserted to have been received into the Catholic Church on his deathbed. He brought up his only daughter a Protestant, and she remained one.

being yet freed from it, engaged me to recommend the enclosed papers to your favor. Therein he asks the King's pardon for his misdemeanors. He thinks this pardon will cost something, and proposes therefore to put £50 into my hands for your fee, £10 for my Lord and £40 for yourself. He wishes Lord Orrery and Lord Anglesey to intercede for him. His friend, Mr. Scardewill, will attend you about it. The other enclosed paper is not in proper form of a warrant, but will inform you of the fact and what the person desires. He does not want it to pass the seal here, but in England; for if it pass here people will hear of his misfortune. Even in England he prays for secrecy."³

If allowance is made for the higher value of money then than now, it will be recognized that the bribe paid for the pardon sought was a fairly considerable one.

On the 6th of August, 1666, Leigh sent an interesting communication to the aforesaid Williamson, in which he described the ceremonial observed at the prorogation of the nearly entirely Protestant Parliament of Ireland, which Ormond was heartily glad to see sent about its business because of its uncompromising disposition. This letter has a special interest nowadays because of its reference to the antagonisms which had manifested themselves between the House of Commons and the House of Lords. Many members of the latter assembly had been faithful adherents of the King in his days of exile, and the satisfaction of their demands for the restitution of their confiscated estates did not at all tally with the interests of the Cromwellian planters or settlers, whose representatives constituted the majority of the lower house. Leigh wrote in part as follows:

"To-day the Lord Lieutenant went in his coach of state to Parliament 'attended by his Guard of Battleaxes and servants of state, the streets being all along lined with the Regiment of Guards from the Castle to the Parliament Houses; where His Grace, meeting the Lords in their own house all in their robes, sent for the House of Commons to come up to him, and then, hearing a long speech that the Speaker made, which contained the summing of all the services which this Parliament have since this meeting rendered to His Majesty, what subsidies and other sums of money they have given to His Majesty (accounting into the bargain the £300,000 which they gave by the Explanatory Act with condition the same should be distributed amongst themselves again) justifying their puntillas about their privileges, giving some reason why they did not think fit to pass the Act of Indemnity and lastly submitting themselves to His Majesty's pleasure either in continuing, proroguing or dissolving them,' my Lord Lieutenant gave the assent to several bills.

³ Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1666-1669, p. 153.

"The Lord Chancellor then made a speech thanking them for their loyalty, reminding them that whatever they gave to the King returned to them again, and giving them several good reasons why they should not remain sitting any longer. He then, in the King's name, bid them be dissolved, to the great satisfaction of thousands of subjects whom the protections and privileges of Parliament had almost destroyed in their fortunes, besides that they began to be extreme troublesome among themselves 'upon the punctilio of privilege with the Lords.' "⁴

The Battleaxe Guards of the Viceroy of Ireland were maintained until long after the passage of the Act of Union. Like the ancient Corps of Gentlemen at Arms connected with the Royal Court of England, it was latterly composed of distinguished officers whose valor in war was considerably in excess of their personal wealth. Its abolition was merely one of the many developments of the policy of the British Treasury in consistently endeavoring to diminish the few refunds Ireland receives from it out of the exorbitant burthen of taxation she is compelled to bear.

The difficulties which the Catholic and other loyalists experienced in securing restitution of their ancestral estates, which had been parcelled out amongst the Cromwellian adventurers, are well exemplified in a letter which the King himself found it necessary to address to the Lord Lieutenant. This missive was sent from Whitehall on the 7th of August, 1666, and was in the following terms:

"We have considered the order of 21 November, 1660, grounded on our late Lord Chancellor of Ireland's report, whereby it appears that Robert Harpole, being in command of a troop of horse, was slain at their head at the storm of Drogheda, and that his son William also served us in Ireland as captain of a troop of horse until he was captured by the party serving the late usurper and put to death by Colonel Axtell. You recommended that William's son, Robert, be restored to the estate of his father and grandfather. We required by our said order that this should be done and by our letters of 3 December, 1660, required the Lords Justices of Ireland to forthwith put our order of 21 November, 1660, into execution. By letters of 12 March, 1661, we repeated that direction. He was nevertheless not restored until, after hearing of his case before the Commissioners of Settlement on 17 August, 1663, he was adjudged innocent and decreed to be put in possession of his estate. The Attorney-General and all others were made parties to the proceedings on which this decree [was made] and those who claimed an interest in any part of the estate by reason of a disposition of the late usurped powers were

⁴ *Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1666-1669*, p. 175.

left to take such proceedings in law and equity as they might be advised; though the usual rule in such cases is that adventurers or soldiers are to have no other satisfaction than reprisals. We are informed that the Attorney-General for Ireland is now prosecuting Harpole for the estate, not taking notice of the late Lord Chancellor's report, which stated that we were bound *ex debito justitiae* to restore him. We therefore declare our pleasure to be that you direct the Attorney-General to forbear such prosecution and to enter an *ulterius non vult prosequi* on the information. Those who had any claim to any part of the estate and have been evicted in consequence of the said decree shall be reprized according to the rules of the Acts of Settlement and Explanation. You shall communicate this order to the Commissioners of Settlement, that they may take speedy order for repring the evicted persons."⁵

The "reprising" thus commanded unfortunately almost necessarily involved injustice to some other loyalists less able to secure the intervention of the King than was Robert Harpole. The case in question, however, makes abundantly clear how difficult was the situation with which Ormond had to deal, and the almost overwhelming impossibility of satisfying the claims of the loyalists without arousing the violent antagonism of the Cromwellian planters who had acquired their lands by the expenditure of much blood and money. Ormond was almost inevitably compelled to adopt a temporizing policy, and, as might have been expected, followed this on lines generally more favorable to the Protestants than to the Catholics, unless in cases where the intervention of the sovereign was successfully involved. Naturally enough, the King was little inclined to provoke an English Protestant rebellion in Ireland—even for sake of his own impoverished adherents—with full knowledge that any such uprising would make much sympathy in England and not improbably result in the overturning of his recently acquired throne, if he acquiesced in its forcible suppression.

A typical example of the hard cases with which both Ormond and the King had constantly to deal was that of Colonel Fitzsimons, who although a Catholic had preferred to stand by the policy of Charles I. as enjoined on the Lord Lieutenant, rather than support that of Rinuccini and the majority of the Catholic Confederation in persisting in armed opposition to the Parliament. As will be seen by the documents we are about to quote, the Colonel gained little by his stubborn display of loyalty to the imprisoned sovereign. There is first set out a summary of a petition from Colonel "Fitzsymons"—as the name was then spelled—which the Lord Lieutenant duly transmitted to the Earl of Chesterfield for submission to the

King. This abbreviated document reads as follows in Mr. Mahaffy's Calendar:

"Petitioner came to Ireland having the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland's encouragement and letters of favor and recommendation (the copy whereof is hereunto annexed) for getting employment in the King's army here. He has attended here for months and presented several petitions setting forth his loyalty and sufferings, and the loss of his estate of £400 a year, and that there is £4,084 due to him for his service done to the King, Charles I. He expected 'comfortable consideration' from your Majesty in respect of these losses, but is reduced to extremity by the delay in answering, and the receiving no satisfactory answer to, his several addresses.

"He prays (if he be not employed) for such consideration for the said £4,084 or the means of a reformed officer towards his present maintenance here, or to allow him competency for his journey back to the place whence he came."⁶

Ormond appears to have given Fitzsimons a letter of introduction to Arlington, which is thus epitomized:

"This bearer, Lieutenant-Colonel Fitzsymons, was an officer in 'the only Irish regiment which, under the command of Sir James Dillon, adhered to the King against all excommunications and intentions of the Nuncio and Irish clergy, when by their instigation the peace made by the Confederate Irish was as foolishly as infamously broken on their side; and yet his religion is such an obstacle to his preferment here as I cannot overcome.' He is a good officer and may safely be trusted in any employment. Pray give this description of him to the King whenever an opportunity shall be offered for his preferment."⁷

There is nothing in the volume before us to show that Colonel Fitzsimons received any recompense for his excessive loyalty to Charles I. and for his desertion of the cause of his co-religionists in accordance with the requirements of the miserable opportunism which more than anything else rendered possible the murderous campaign of conquest waged by Cromwell.

Meantime Ormond, by means of a host of agents, spies and informers, was keeping a close watch on the Catholics and their chief representatives, both at home and abroad. On the 24th of November, 1666,⁸ he forwarded from Kilkenny to Arlington, in London, communications from three of his creatures. One of these was a letter written from Paris in Irish by a Sir James Dillon, who told the Lord Lieutenant, according to the translation which the latter

⁶ Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1666-1669, p. 190.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 191.

⁸ Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1666-1669, p. 247.

supplied to Arlington, that he "should not be an upright man" if he "were not still mindful and careful of all you gave me in charge when I came out of Ireland." This Sir James Dillon was actually colonel of a regiment in the French army at the time when he was thus corresponding with Ormond. He went on to say that "there are doubtless ill-affected Irishmen in Paris" who "make it their work to recover their rights in Ireland by French power." He added, however:

"My friends in the French Court tell me that the French will not hazard themselves or their goods. But you must be very wary and have a care of the coasts of Ulster and Connaught. I have more to tell your lordship, but thought that this was enough to put you 'on your keeping.' I hope you will shortly see there a special friend of your own, who will inform you of all the news. In the meantime, if you think I should stay here, command me."

The second document forwarded by Ormond to Arlington was one received by him from a Colonel J. Atkins, resident in Germany, telling of the presence in that island of Dr. Lynch, Bishop of Galway and Kilpenora, who "endeavors to make a party," but in whose side he hoped to be "a bad thorn." The third missive is the most interesting of all because of the fact that it casts some light on the conditions under which the Irish priesthood were living in their native land at this time. This was a report from the Lord Lieutenant's chief secretary, Sir Paul Davys, setting out the substance of a report received by him from Sir Oliver St. George, then in Connaught. As epitomized by Mr. Mahaffy this reads as follows:

"Sir Kenelm Digby's son stayed but a short time after his arrival here (as Sir Oliver St. George tells me), but went to Connaught, and within two or three miles of Athlone lodged in the house of a Popish priest by Ballemullen. Sir Oliver does not know the priest's name, 'and that Mr. Digby should stay so long at the house of that priest, which, I am told, is a very mean cottage, unfit for the reception of such a person . . . is that which may seem strange, unless he were there upon some affair which he has worthy his so long attendance on it, notwithstanding the badness of his accommodation.'

"He has, I think, no estate in this kingdom, which might draw him hither, nor are there any great matters of curiosity to be here observed by him, nor any advantage to be gained. For him thus to come and travel so speedily into the remote parts of the kingdom is what may induce a 'jalousie' what he comes about.

"P. S.—Sir Arthur Forbes told me yesterday that the French King has, he is informed, prepared several thousands of saddles and pistols which are in readiness at a town in France by the seaside next

Ireland. I desired him to write to your Grace about it, as it tallies with other information which you have received."⁹

Sad as the picture is of the poor priest dwelling in his "very mean cottage," it stands to the credit of Ormond and of Charles II. that at this time, not only in Connaught, but in Dublin itself as well as in other parts of the country, there was virtually a suspension of active persecution and the pastors were gradually returning to their flocks. No doubt formidably worded proclamations were periodically issued in pursuance of the enactments of Parliament, but occult influence exercised most probably by the King's Catholic mother and Catholic wife prevented any very rigorous application of their provisions. The simple truth is that Ormond and his royal master stood very much more in dread of the Cromwellian Nonconformists of Ulster than of the Papists, whose loyalty to the throne had been well attested in the days of Charles I. and was yet to be confirmed in blood in those of James II. Proof of the correctness of this assertion is afforded by a letter written from Kilkenny by the Lord Lieutenant to Arlington on the 8th of December, 1666. In this we read:

"I shall be as watchful as I can over the north of this kingdom when there certainly are many as ill inclined as those in rebellion in Scotland; and lately I hear of two pernicious fellows, who call themselves ministers, come out of Scotland, who have a great concourse of people that follow them and hear them preach all manner of sedition. I have sent orders to apprehend them, and when I shall have spoken with my Lord of Dungannon, who is Governor of a great part of that province, all other needful orders shall be given. In the meantime I have ordered any of His Majesty's frigates now at Dublin to lie between the north of Ireland and Scotland, and to take a strict account of all that shall pass those seas. This is all I can do at present to prevent contagion from Scotland. I shall soon be nearer those parts and ready, if need be, to visit them in a few hours' warning."¹⁰

According to a "Memorandum on the Religion, State and Revenue of Ireland," which Ormond appears to have had prepared and which Mr. Mahaffy has reproduced, there would seem to have actually been more priests in Ireland in 1666 than there are to-day. Of course, the estimate must have been an exaggerated one, but at any rate it reads thus:

"The Papists in Ireland are 800,000, and, to the Protestants, in the proportion of 8 to 3. Their priests and friars are about 4,000 in number and, to the Protestant preachers, in the proportion of 8 to 1.

⁹ Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1666-1669, p. 248.

¹⁰ Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1666-1669, p. 251.

The sub-sheriffs, sheriffs, bailiffs, head and petty constables, are about 3,000 persons, and about one-tenth of those are Protestants. The barristers-at-law are near two-thirds Papists, and the pretended Protestants officiating about the Four Courts are very numerous and busy. Of Justices of the Peace there have been of late nearly 100 Papists. The holy days observed more by Papists than by Protestants are a tenth part of the whole year, whereby, and by the superfluous priests (if any at all were necessary), Ireland is damned if £300,000 per annum, or one-third of its revenue.

"The government of the common Papists is by their priests, they by their Bishops and superiors, and then again by foreign ministers, especially French. The Papists maintain agents in every court. In brief, their power and interest is such as His Majesty's late orders for disarming them and removing of regulars had little or no effect. The Protestant bishoprics are near equal to those in England, and their revenue about two-thirds of the English. There be many Deans and Chapters in Ireland, but few cathedrals in repair, and scarce three quires. Preaching ministers [are] about 500. The parishes in Ireland are twice or thrice as large as in England, and three, four or five of them are united to make up a living for a minister. The inappropriate tithes are many."¹¹

The general tone of this memorandum would seem to indicate that its true purpose was to create fears in England as to a possible revival of Catholic dominance in Ireland. It seems practically impossible that there can have been in the country anything at all approaching the number of clergy set down in it. If there were, the fact affords remarkable proof of the leniency with which the penal laws were being applied. That Ormond detested the idea of anything in the nature of general persecution of the Catholics or their priests at this time, while he was furiously earnest in seeking to cajole or coerce the latter into accepting the supremacy of the King rather than that of the Pope in matters ecclesiastical, is convincingly attested by a long letter which he wrote from Dublin Castle on the 4th of January, 1667, to Arlington. In the course of this he told the Secretary of State that:

"The connivance afforded to several of the Romish clergy to meet here last summer having not had the effect of a general subscription to the Remonstrance proposed to them, and yet having succeeded as far as comes to the creating of a division amongst them, that connivance is now called to mind, and aspersed by some out of their inclination to scandalize the government and perhaps taking occasion so to do upon the proceedings had in England against all of the Romish persuasion, not considering or not willing to take notice of

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 261.

the different constitution of both kingdoms, the Romish recusants in England not being the hundredth part of the people, but, in Ireland, four parts of five.”¹²

It will be observed that in these words the Lord Lieutenant bears testimony to the magnificent determination with which the people generally were standing fast by the faith of their fathers. In face of this circumstance and of the other that the majority of the clergy absolutely refused to even look at the schismatical Remonstrance drafted by Walsh, he proposed to issue a proclamation banishing from the country all who might still decline to sign it after a certain date. As to the wisdom of doing even as much as this, Ormond had his doubts and quite frankly expressed them to Arlington. He had before his eyes, however, the rising tide of Protestant intolerance, and—like his royal master—dreaded the effect in England if this broke into stormy demonstrations. He went on to say:

“The principal difficulty of wording the Proclamation will consist in avoiding the misconstruction of the distinction that will be made between subscribers and refusers and leaving it liable to the interpretation of a pretended banishment of some and a real toleration to others to exercise their functions; and in our care to avoid this objection we may fall into a declaration which may involve the best and most conformable part of that clergy which would give the others opportunity to triumph over them. I am not sure that this is a fit time to expose such an instrument to the world, for it may perhaps produce an address to extend the banishment to all, which would be highly inconvenient and dangerous now to do and perhaps not very convenient or safe to refuse.”¹³

Ormond added that meantime, while the proclamation was being drafted, he was taking steps to “cause divers of the worse affected of the clergy who have refused to subscribe the Remonstrance to be arrested.” This, however, he had done because he had “found it absolutely necessary in order to satisfy the expectations of all the Protestants here,” and which would thereby be in some degree “complied with” and “satisfied.” Not improbably for the satisfaction of the King and his Catholic wife and mother the Lord Lieutenant went on to assure Arlington that:

“The worst affected only will be punished, and this will be good for the country, which is not in greater danger from our enemies abroad than from these at home. These have refused to give assurance of their loyalty, and are industrious to persuade to rebellion those whom they take upon themselves to teach. I hear it has been suggested to the King that this prosecution of the non-sub-

¹² Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1666-1669, pp. 264, 265.

¹³ Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1666-1669, p. 265.

scribers would leave the Popish part of the people without any pastors. That is a 'frivilous' objection, since members of the Popish clergy continued here under a persecution of another kind than ever I shall advise to be brought upon them or willingly become an actor in. But it is said that the King has been told this, and that it weighs with him so as to make him disapprove of the further tender of the Remonstrance."¹⁴

Of course, no one knew better than did Charles II. that the document in question was utterly un-Catholic and schismatical. The idea of defending the new persecution on the ground that the clergy had remained steadfastly by their flocks in the days of persecution even worse than "ever I shall advise to be brought upon them or willingly become an actor in" was distinctly Ormondesque. On the 8th of April His Excellency had alarming intelligence to send Arlington, indicating as it did that Franco-Irish spies were being landed in Ireland and conveying munitions of war. He wrote as follows:

"I have intelligence which I think is well grounded that one Byrne (that fellow that attempted the murdering of my Lord Newburgh in Flanders and took sanctuary at Fontenae [Fontenoy], when he was there apprehended for it) was set on shore the first of this month on the shore of Wicklow. My intelligencer had it from a friar, who also spoke of some few arms and a small proportion of powder landed with him and hid in a sandbank. The friar said he was to return to the French fleet at Brest to give an account of the kingdom in general and particularly of that fitness of that shore for landing men. I have laid the best I could for his apprehension. If I catch him it shall go hard, but I will have the truth out of him. If the French have any design upon this kingdom there is no doubt but that, if they will venture into these channels, the first place for them to attempt would be Dublin, which neither is nor can be made strong but by numbers of men. What to think of it your Lordship will know by your intelligence and by the progress of the Treaty."¹⁵

Eventually the aforesaid Byrne was arrested and proved to be a miserable kind of creature enough, being quite ready to turn informer and to betray to Ormond all who according to him had given him shelter or succor on his arrival in Ireland. His full name was Robert Byrne, and he described himself as having served in Colonel Dillon's regiment in the army employed in Flanders in 1653. Thence, according to his narrative, he went to France, afterward visiting Amsterdam and Cleves. How he found money for these wanderings he did not explain, but he asserted that while at Cleves he held

¹⁴ Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1666-1669, p. 265.

¹⁵ Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1666-1669, p. 342.

the rank of lieutenant colonel of his old regiment. Altogether there seems to be no doubt that life in Ireland in 1667 was apt to prove productive of adventures of various kinds, all more or less risky for the participants. For instance, on the 12th of April of that year Robert Leigh wrote to Joseph Williamson from Charlestown, telling the latter that:

"Since my being here, in the country there hath appeared a new tribe of Scotch Tories, three of which, excellent well horsed and armed with iron Scotch pistols at their girdles besides two in their holsters, met the Sheriff of the next county (who having left the judge at Philipstown, hard by here, was coming back this way with very few in his company) at a place Portnehinch, about a mile off, upon this estate of my Lord Arlington's, too, and, the Sheriff examining what they were, answered him with their pistols so that the Sheriff was fain to betake himself, his, and the rest to swords. The Tories held it out stubbornly, but at last one of them was left for dead and the other two, having their horses killed, got into the bog and escaped us."¹⁶

It was probably as well for the Sheriff's health that he made no attempt to follow the Tories into the bog, through the morasses of which the latter knew the few solid paths, knowledge of which alone made safe passage possible. Living burial would have been the shrieval fate had he been less prudent. On the whole, however, he seems to have borne himself manfully so long as conflict was confined to dry land and to have rendered a good account of his assailants. During the existence of the Cromwellian usurpation Catholics, no matter what their social position or wealth, had been ruthlessly banished from the walled towns or cities, being, however, graciously accorded "liberty" to dispose of their possessions therein to Protestant purchasers if they could find such within a strictly limited period. This, of course, was really equivalent to forfeiture, because the number of possible purchasers was necessarily extremely limited, and those to be found naturally knew that the Catholic proprietors had no choice save to sell at whatever price they thought fit to offer. When, however, certain of the more favored or more lucky adherents of the royal cause were restored to their estates they promptly recognized that by bringing pressure to bear on the Puritan purchasers of Catholic properties they might easily add to their own wealth. Many of these lately enriched cavaliers were Protestants, but whatever their creed the process was the same. How it was worked is exemplified in a letter from the King to the Lord Lieutenant written on behalf of the Earl of Arran and dated 20th of April, 1667. This, as set out by Mr. Mahaffy, ran as follows:

¹⁶ Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1666-1669, pp. 344, 345.

"The Earl of Arran gives us to understand that the late powers, by their public order, gave liberty to the former ancient proprietors of houses in the city and liberties of Galway to sell their interest there to any English Protestant, and that, pursuant thereto, Robert Clarke, and others from whom he derives his title, purchased several houses and lands in Galway, that is to say, one house with its appurtenances standing in Littlegate street (except a cellar) formerly the property of James Darcy, one house with the appurtenances standing in Flood street, formerly the property of Stephen Browne and Julian Blake, one house, &c., standing in the corner between Littlegate street and Flood street with one cellar under the house of John Boy Linch in Upper Broagmaker's lane, and one waste 'platt' of ground in Bodkin's lane, formerly the property of Oliver Browne and Julian his wife, one house, &c., standing between Middle street and High street, formerly the property of Dominick Bodkin Fitzjohn, one house, &c., standing in Flood street, formerly the property of James Martin Fitzjeofery, one house, &c., standing in Lombard street (the parlour and one cellar excepted), formerly the property of Oliver French, one house formerly the property of Patrick Kerewan in the High street, one shop formerly the property of Pierce Lynch in the same, one house and waste plot of ground in Flood street, formerly the property of John Linch Fitz Richard, one house, &c., and two-third parts of a field or close called Gortnelickie [Gortnalecka], formerly the property of Edmund Kerewan and purchased by Robert Clarke as aforesaid. All these houses are in the town and liberties aforesaid.

"The Commissioners of Settlement found that all these houses were purchased for good consideration and not seized or sequestered, and therefore ordered that they should not be included in the certificate given to the '49 officers and that the title of the purchasers thereof should be preserved to them. The Earl has bought them from Robert Clarke and has asked us, for securing his title thereto, to accept a surrender of them and regrant them to him. On receipt of these letters and of a surrender by the Earl of the premises, you shall cause patents to pass, &c., in Ireland in accordance with his request. Reserve a rent of E 10s. a year and insert beneficial clauses in the grant."¹⁷

This is a lengthy document, but it is of importance as exemplifying what was going on in all the cities and towns of the country at this time. It is also of value as indicating how largely Catholic was Galway in the days of Charles I. and how ready its Catholic citizens were to sacrifice their properties rather than save them by making pretence of profession of Protestantism.

¹⁷ Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1666-1669, pp. 348, 349.

On the 15th of June, 1667, Ormond wrote to Arlington communicating a decision of the Irish Privy Council, which illustrates in convincing fashion the difficulties with which he had to contend. He said in this missive:

"The case of Alderman Barker and others his partners went against him by vote of the Council on Wednesday last. The consequence is that all the land he pretended to is in the King, where I desire it may remain till I am able to dispose of it to the most meriting and indigent perons, who are like to be disappointed of the grace intended for them by the Act of Settlement. All confiscations are due to them until they have land of at least the value proposed for them. The Alderman made many friends for himself here in a case as void of right I think as ever I judged in my life; and no doubt will be as industrious on the other side. Pray have him looked to lest the King be surprized into favouring him before he knows what obligations are upon him."¹⁸

The Lord Lieutenant's surmise as to the probable action of Barker and partners proved to be correct, for two days later, on the 17th of June, these worthies entered the following caveat against ratification of the decision of the Privy Council:

"The several lands undermentioned are such that were set out to your supplicants for an adventure of £7,000 subscribed and paid upon the Acts of 17 and 18 Charles I., of which lands they were actually possessed, the 7th May, 1659, as other adventures were of forfeited lands in Ireland. Your supplicants are informed that some evil disposed persons, coveting their vineyards, have informed His Majesty that these lands were not given out to adventurers and are now in the King's dispose, and are trying to get His Majesty to dispose these lands to them. That His Majesty may not be deceived in his grant nor your honour in letting the same pass His Majesty's signature to the prejudice of His Majesty's good subjects, your supplicants pray that this their humble request may be received and accepted as *caveat* from them that the said lands may not be passed by His Majesty to your supplicant's prejudice until they by their counsel be first heard."¹⁹

The lands in question totalled 12,254 acres, and when they came to be distributed only two Catholics received portion thereof—namely, Lord Iveagh, 1,500 acres, and one Maximilian Dempsey, another 1,500. The rest were handed over to Protestants. A few years later Lord Iveagh adhered to the cause of James II., fought for him at the Boyne, Aughrim and elsewhere, followed him to France, was attainted and all his property bestowed on the Pro-

¹⁸ Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1666-1669, p. 376.

¹⁹ Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1666-1669, p. 377.

testant supporters of William III. It may be said that if he had adopted another political course this would not have occurred, but the penal statutes enacted by the Irish Parliament in contravention of the provisions of the Treaty of Limerick would have made their retention by him impossible unless he abandoned his religion.

Reference has already been made to the case of Robert Byrne, who seems to have been busily engaged in endeavoring to make up evidence to connect the clergy with political plots. All the time, of course—previous to his arrest—the rascal was posing as an earnest patriot and a devout Catholic. The mere fact that he appears to have been eventually released and allowed to go scot free indicates that he had been throughout a spy in the pay of the English Government. Moreover, it is quite clear that there were others domiciled in Ireland, and judging by their names Catholics also, who were quite willing to assist him in his nefarious work of endeavoring to implicate the priesthood, and especially the members of the religious orders, in the supposed treasonable schemes he described. We find Ormond, for example, transmitting to London the following document:

Copy of Examination of Patrick Keghoe, or Keogho, of Marshaltown, in the barony of Skerriwalsh [Scarawalsh], in the co. Wexford, gent.

He says that about the third or fourth day of April last David Lenan, a Dominican friar, met the examinee at Coolesagard, within a mile of Lymbbrick, in the county of Wexford, at which time Lenan told the examinee that one Robert Byrne (who had been in the French fleet) landed about 1 April last at Cloncarrig, co. Wexford, and that he brought with him one hundred arms, and nine barrels of powder; that the said arms and powder were brought on shore and hidden under some banks of sand, and that if the examinee wished to speak with Byrne, or join him in an-armed rising, he could meet Byrne at Ballyloughlan [Loughlinstown], between Dublin and Bray, about seven miles from Dublin; that Derby Doyle, a Popish priest, who lives at Ballyloughlin, and thereabouts, is a person with whom Byrne might be found, or who could tell about him, and that Byrne passes by the name of Alfonso Besery. The examinee now hears that he calls himself John de France.

Furthermore, Ormond sent on a long deposition by Byrne, in which he placed the whole responsibility for his landing in Ireland and the supposed importation of warlike stores on the Irish exiles in Paris, and especially on the "Popish priests" there. Even the papers forwarded by the Lord Lieutenant to London showed in the clearest manner possible that the arrest of this scoundrel was brought about by information supplied by a Catholic clergyman. One of these was in part as follows:

Copy of Deposition of Thomas Harney, of Knockloe, co. Wicklow, gentleman.
Being duly sworn, he says that:

He heard from James Nolan, a Popish priest from Tallow [Tullow], co. Carlow, of the arrival of Byrne. Byrne was, he heard, sent to dissuade the Irish from flying when the French landed, and to signify to them that the French would oppress no man, but would pay money for what they should take from any man. The next day (about Wednesday last) George Cullen, of Clonmore, co. Carlow, told the examinee of the arrival of one "Toby Birne" [Byrne], who had been a captain of horse in the Irish army in Ireland, and afterwards a lieutenant-colonel in France, and now in pay there,

and that he was sent to tell all the Irish who could be trusted "that there was an intention of the landing of a French army in Ireland within five weeks; and that although there seemed to be something towards concluding peace between the King of England and the French King, yet that it was resolved by the French King not to conclude any peace unless the King of England would relinquish his title to France, and recall all the plantations that had been made in Ireland since the time of the reign of the late Queen Elizabeth, and restore to the Irish all the lands they had since that time sold." Cullen told the examinee that Byrne had told him, Cullen, that he, the said Byrne, had fully informed himself of all the seaports in Leinster, and of the strength of every garrison, and that there were some landed in every province to gain the like information; and particularly that one Bryan Roe O'Neile was landed in the north of Ireland. Byrne had, the examinee was told, received letters from this O'Neile. The examinee thought that Byrne was a dangerous person, and that he should do the King a service by apprehending him. He found out from Cullen where Byrne could be found, and that he was on his keeping and feared that the Duke of Ormond, who had word of his coming, would arrest him. He, Reeves, and others went to Cullen's house on the night of May 7, apprehended Byrne, and brought him to Hacketstown.

Now, Father Darby Doyle, whom such determined effort was made to implicate in the supposed plot, when brought before the Privy Council was not even put to the oath, and told what was palpably a perfectly honest story. It was thus recorded:

Copy of Examination of Darby Doyle, Popish Priest, of Donabrooke [Donnybrook], in the County of the City of Dublin.

Being examined, he says that:

He first knew Byrne at Anwerp [Antwerp] about twelve years ago. On the week before Easter Day last, when the examinee was at Bullock, co. Dublin, one Dorothy Byrne, who is the wife of Peirs Gowe, a smith, who dwells at Munckstown [Monkstown], came to him, the examinee, and brought him a paper written in Latin. The examinee could not read it, it was so ill-written, and he laid it aside. It was signed by a name which he did not know. He does not know what became of it. On the same day as he was going from Bullock towards Merrion, the Earl of Tyrconnell's house, he met Byrne, who asked him if he knew him. The examinee, "earnestly viewing him," remembered having seen him in the Low Countries, and asked if he was Robert Byrne whom he so remembered. Byrne assented, and when told that the examinee was on his way to Merrion, where the Earl of Tyrconnell was dying, asked the examinee to appoint a time and place where he could meet the examinee. The examinee said they might meet the same night at Byrne's lodgings at Munckstown [Monkstown], but they did not meet; nor has the examinee since communicated with him. Byrne told the examinee nothing about his having brought arms, etc., to Ireland, or about the intention of the French to invade Ireland, or anything to the like effect.

Postscript.—Byrne asked the examinee for one Morgan Cullen, a chyrurgeon, who lives in St. Francis Street in the Combe. The examinee told him Cullen was dangerously ill; but Cullen is since recovered.²⁰

It is eminently worthy of note that even while the Castle scriveners were transcribing these documents, Ormond does not appear to have thought it worth his while to cause any search to be made for the store of arms alleged by Byrne to have been landed and hidden on the coast of Wexford. The courteous treatment accorded Father Doyle indicates pretty clearly that neither His Excellency nor his colleagues of the Privy Council believed a word of Byrne's tale.

WILLIAM F. DENNEHY.

Dublin, Ireland.

²⁰ Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1666-1669, pp. 620, 622, 623.

CONTRACT AS THE ORIGIN OF GOVERNMENT.

I.

IT is given as a token of advanced liberty in the course of ages that whereas of old man's position in life was fixed for him by his status, now it is left to his own free contract. Status is regarded by H. Spencer as marking the *régime* specially proper to the militant type of society, which is characterized by graduated ranks in its fighting body.¹ Doomsday book is a work which furnishes an example of the way in which a man's position in society was settled by the condition to which he was born. Of the population at the time about nine per cent. were slaves, about thirty-two per cent. cotters bound to the soil and subject to a lord, while about thirty-eight per cent. were villeins, whose position was better indeed than that of the cotters, but who could not, unless they became free tenants, break away from the tie of *ascriptio glebae*. Such was the rule, though upon it certain strong individuals managed to force exceptions in their own favor. For a long time afterwards those closed corporations, the industrial or the commercial guilds,² prevented entrance into their business at the choice of applicants, and he who could make his way into no guild was generally in a poor condition. To the man that had it was given, to him that had not it was refused; blessed were the possessors. This was at least one form of what Brennus called "the oldest of all laws, which reaches from God to the beasts—that the stronger should rule over the weaker."³

Though some sort of an idea of contract appeared sporadically in old speculations about the origin of government, and notably was mentioned by St. Thomas,⁴ it was not till the time of Hobbes that this notion took the prominence which it has maintained in modern times. Among the Greeks his ideas had some foreshadowing in the words of Glaucon (*Repub.* 358, 359): "They say that to do injustice

¹ "Political Institutions," Chap. XVIII., p. 567. Sir H. Maine says: "Authority, custom or chance are the great sources of law in primitive communities as we know them, not contract. In the minds of men at this stage of thought the acknowledged sources of law are not clearly discriminated."

² An act of Parliament in 1363 ordained that "two of every craft should be chosen to survey that none use other craft than the same which he has chosen," without much liberty of choice.

³ Plutarch's "Life of Camillus," Chap. XVII.

⁴ *De Regimine Principis*, Lib. I., Cap. VI. *Nec putanda est multitudo infideliter agere tyrannum destituens, etiamsi eidem in perpetuo se ante subjecerat: quia hoc ipse meruit in multitudinis regimine se non fideliter gerens ut exigit regio officium quod ei pactum a subditis non reservetur.*

is by nature good, but that consequent evil exceeds the good. So that after men had gone through both experiences—that of doing and that of suffering evil—then having found themselves unable to be inflicters without being also inflicted upon, they thought they had better agree together against each alternative, and therefore arose laws and governments, and that which was ordained by law they called the just. Such, it is affirmed, was the origin and nature of justice, which comes to a compromise between the best of all, which is to do and not to suffer injury, and the worst of all, which is to suffer without the means of retaliation." So justice is accepted, not as good, but as the lesser evil. No man who is worthy to be called a man submits to such an evil if he can help it; he would not be man if he did. In another place Plato expresses a view so depreciatory of mere human sociability that he supposes a divine instinct to have been needed for the formation of States, and to have been given so extensively that the political art was communicated even to the working classes. Aristotle is more wholly humanistic. The State, according to him, was not merely by nature, but also by appointment. From the expression *νομον τεθεωτι* to the term *συνθηκη* or *contract*, the passage is inevitable.⁵

The Romans, with their sense of law, naturally took a more juridical view of the State. Cicero mentions an opinion that it originated in compact: *Quia nemo sibi confidit, quasi pactio fit inter populum et potentes ex qua existit conjunctum civitatis genus.* (De Repub iii., 13.) The lawyers in the time of the empire took great care to assert the whole of the imperial power to be a delegation from the people by the *lex regia: lege antiqua quae regia nuncupatur omne jus omnisque potestas populi Romani in imperatoriam translata sunt potestatem.* (Codex i., 17; ii., 7.) Such a theory was meant to take all sting out of the apparently despotic maxim that the imperial edict was law.⁶ (Gaius Instit. i., 2, 7.) So spoke the Romans from a legalist point of view; from the literary aspect they recounted rather the legendary origin of State power. Seneca⁷ gives an individualistic view, quoting the example of the strong bull that leads the herd: *Non praecedit armenta degener taurus;* but he adds that as corruption spoilt the golden age of born leaders, the wisdom of laws had to take the place of personal guidance.

Among Christian writers Eusebius tells how Adam's proximate descendants deteriorated and the race fell into a disorderly, brutal condition of life, without city, without State, without arts or phil-

⁵ Pol. I., 2, 8. Cf. Plato Rep. 359 B. Laws III., 684, where there is mention of an agreement between governors and governed.

⁶ Quod principi placuit legis habet vigorem—often satirized in the actual futility of imperial decrees.

⁷ Ep. xc. Edit Elsevir.

osophy, without laws of justice; they wandered as savages in the desert, lost to reason and to discipline. It was God's covenant with the Jews that lifted men from this depth.⁸ Abelard quotes a story that the human herd was raised up to rational life in society by a *vir Magnus et sapiens*.⁹ Rabanus Maurus attributes civil organization to the gradual evolution of the race, so that there appeared in progressive series huts, houses and towns. In the last named was the great source of protection against barbarians and of power to make advances in social condition. *Haec et oppidorum origo, quae ex eo quod opem darent, idcirco oppida nominata dixerant.* Others reverse the procedure and would show some sympathy with Shakespeare's Prince in "The Tempest," Act II., scene 1:

"If the commonwealth I would by contraries execute all things; for no kind of traffic would I admit; no name of magistrate; letters should not be none; riches, poverty and use of service, none; contract, succession, bourn, bound of land, tilth, vineyard, none; no use of metal, corn, or oil, or wine; no occupation; all men idle—all; no sovereignty.

"All things in common nature should produce, without sweat or endeavor; treason, felony, sword, pike, knife, gun, or need of any, I would not have; but nature should bring forth of its own kind all foison, all abundance to feed my innocent people. I would with such perfection govern, sir, to excel the golden age."

The Christian writers of the Middle Ages offered abundant suggestion for Hobbes whence to derive, if not his absolutism, yet his theory that governmental power originates in contract. Thus from the documents collected in the *Monumenta Germanica* Mr. H. Fisher concludes that the "act of deposing Henry IV. asserted that sovereignty was based on contract, and that if the King broke his oath to his people, they were absolved from their oath to him. Against the other view that the King was the irresponsible vicegerent of God upon earth, it asserted the view that he was a responsible agent, who could be deposed for ignoring his responsibilities." When at the end of the Middle Ages Italy was in the throes of reconstitution after utter disruption, Machiavelli taught that a people radically corrupt can be kept in control only by law strongly enforced; that after the brave and muscular had first brought about some order, then the wise and just had been able to rule for a time; but that in the Italy of his own day morality in public affairs could no longer be effective and must give way to the laws of State necessities. Villari, if not wholly a safe guide, may furnish some idea of what was

⁸ H. E., 1, 2. Lactantius gives a similar sketch of the decline. Div. Instit. III., 21 and 22.

⁹ De Rhetorica et Virtutibus.

then going on. Out of a previous commune at Milan the Visconti and Sforza formed a tyranny. About 1378 two of the Visconti entered into mutual conflict, both being equal in vice and ambition. The nephew succeeded in throwing the uncle, with his children, into prison, whence they never issued. Himself, without military skill, without even courage, from the safe shelter of his castle of Pavia, employed captains, and diplomatists, and intriguers to form for him an extended duchy of Milan, in which were contained Genoa, Bologna and Tuscany. His son succeeded to the possessions, a troublesome brother being got rid of by assassination. The son, like his father, had the skill to use in his service the most efficient agents and to control them by setting one against another. "Surrounded by spies, shut up in the castle of Milan, he duped everybody, always finding fresh opportunities to deceive. By force of diabolical cunning he held his paternal estate up to the day of his death, 1447." Next came the Sforza dynasty, from a family of adventurers. "Francesco was a great captain, an acute politician, who knew how to play with the lion and the fox; when bloodshed was necessary he did not shrink from it, but at other times he sought to distribute impartial justice. He was succeeded by his dissolute son, Galeazzo Maria, who perished by assassination." Such were the vicissitudes of Milan, while Florence, Machiavelli's own city, had similar disturbances as it passed from the Medici to the republicans and then back again for a short time to the Medici. Rude facts like these, exemplifying that abuse of power which Bishop Creighton calls one of the blackest blots on history, make positivist writers very impatient with theoretic, legal, ethical theories concerning the origin of civil power. Nevertheless, it will be worth while to examine the theory of contract taught by some of its chief representatives, though the exemplification of it in history seldom appears with all the clearness, formality and legitimacy which we find in the signing of the American Confederation. We may take in order the views expressed about civil contract by Hobbes, Locke, Spinoza and Rousseau, all typical names in the matter under examination. Hobbes we will consider simply in his works aside from the charge which he had to meet in his own day that parts of his writings were no parts of his doctrine, but the exigences of his fears.

The theory of Hobbes is not easily statable with precision, because in spite of his reputation for clear, manly exposition there is very much in detail to be said against his claim. Some of his arguments and definitions are so insufficient that they hardly seem serious, while at times the difficulties of his course make him to be devious or evasive. The instance specially to the point at present is that he has two uses of the phrase "natural law." Nor does he really help

the matter by pretending to distinguish between *lex* and *jus* (*Leviathan* xiv.). Rarely if ever is he at pains clearly to conciliate or discriminate two conditions by any such distinction as St. Paul makes between the "law of the flesh" and the "law of the spirit." Not exactly as an historic fact,¹⁰ ever verified universally, but as an artifice of exposition, Hobbes first assumes a "state of nature," in which the "law of nature" was that which was adapted to the wholly selfish, passion-led man who had a right to all things and to the services of all persons, a right limited in exercise only by the limit of his power to obtain what he demanded. "Nature had given to every man a right to all—that is, it was lawful for every man in that state of nature, or before such times as men had engaged themselves in any covenant, to do what he would and against whom he thought fit, and to possess use and enjoy all that he could get." (*De Cive*, chap i., n. 10.)¹¹

In that condition of no bargain entered into among men, there could be no injustice to man, though there could be offense of God, which would be no violation of human justice: "What any man does in a bare state of nature is an injustice to no man; not that in such a state he cannot offend God or break the laws of nature,¹² for injustice against men presupposeth human laws, such as in the state of nature there are none." (*De Cive*, ch. i., n. 10, note.) Hence there is no private property at that stage, "for propriety receives its beginning when cities receive theirs, and that only is proper to each man which he can keep by the laws and the power of the whole city," to enforce observance. (*Ch. vi.*, n. 15.) The result is a war of all against the rest, in which struggle no individual can hope to be long prosperous; for in such a conflict powers are practically equalized and the comparatively weak may kill the comparatively strong. Life, while it can then be maintained, is "solitary, poor, nasty, brutal and short." (*Leviathan*, ch. xiii.) Under such evil

¹⁰ *Leviathan*, Chap. XIII. Several of the classical writers describe a feral condition of man as they describe also a golden age for the beginning, but they are not writing historically—e. g., Lucretius, V., 925 sqq.; Horace Satires, I, 3, 101 sqq.

¹¹ If there had been any man of power irresistible, there had been no reason why he should not have ruled the rest by that power, as God's right to reign over men is not derived from creation, but from irresistible power.—*Leviathan*, XXXI. Lactantius asks: "If each individual had strength enough to ward off all dangers, with no need of an assistant, what society would there be in the world? What mutual respect, what order, what more fierce and cruel than man?" *De Opific Dei*, Cap. IV.

¹² Hobbes is quite perplexing unless we remember that he has two, or even three, laws of nature—pre-social, post-social and God-ordained as distinguished from man-ordained. When it suits him, instead of man the strong animal, ruled by brute power, he talks of man, "the rational and most excellent work of nature." (Introduction to *Leviathan*.)

circumstances, especially out of fear for life and limb, men seek compromise in the formation of a society, not because of social disposition in the good sense. The pre-social man is not *zwov tioyitjckov* by nature;¹³ what drives him to society is, on the positive side, love of gain in trade, love of glorifying self and humiliating others in conversation, with desire also among the learned to wrangle in philosophy; on the negative side it is fear of evil to himself from others. In a better mood Hobbes adds: "It is a precept of reason that every man endeavor peace." (*Leviathan*, chap. xiii.) In infancy human nature is not fit for society; even after education many persons remain unfit. "All society is either for gain or glory," which are "all the mind's pleasure."

Nor was the estimate limited to the small families which we might call savage. "As small families did then, so now do cities and kingdoms." (*Chap. xiii.*) He repeatedly quotes our every-day experience of anti-social nature, thus confusing together the condition before and the condition after the contract. Here, then, we have had described for us one "state of nature" with its "natural law" or "natural right," assigning to each man according to his power the *just* to take and keep possession. Hobbes offers no such explanation of precontractual men as Rousseau does of his state of nature, which he calls a condition of animal contentment that does not rise to the level of moral perception, and is something like Plato's "swine city." Spinoza also is careful to say that before revelation, which bears for him quite a sense of his own, man was below the condition of having that knowledge of God which Hobbes seems generally to assume in his "state of nature," though he does make the remark: "Actions proceeding from passion are not sins till men know that the law forbids them, which till the laws be made they cannot know." (*Leviathan*, chap. xiii.) The latter writer might have given some plausibility to his view if he had said consistently throughout that what he was trying to describe was a hypothetical condition, the state in which mankind would have been if they had refused to follow their better impulse to restrain their individual appetites by agreeing for the common good to unite in a social compact of mutual forbearance. But he makes no attempt at exactitude.

We come next to his second "state of nature," which is that of rational and God-imposed order, in which there is introduced the reign of law, "the immutable and eternal laws of nature." "God declarereth laws in three ways: by the dictates of natural reason; by

¹³ By contrast, Aristotle *Polit.*, III., 4, shows forth very well. He says: "Man by nature is a social being." Therefore, even when men are not in need of help from one another, they seek life in society. They gather together not for mere utility, but for the positive purpose of a noble life.

revelation, and by the voice of some man to whom, through the operation of miracles, he procureth credit with the rest." (*Leviathan*, ch. xxxi.) We now get quite a different condition among men. "Reason is no less of the nature of man than passion, and there can be no other law of nature than reason," though Hobbes manages to say much of another "law of nature," which is antirational. "There can be no other precepts of the natural law than those which declare unto us the ways of peace or of defense." (*De Corpore Politico*, Part I., ch. i., n. 1.) One such precept is "that every man divest himself of the right he had to all things by nature" (n. 2)—by means of a "contract" (n. 8), the force of which is binding, for "every man is obliged to perform his contracts" (Chap. iii., n. 1). Elsewhere the obligation of contracts is made to depend on the contract, which here it is supposed to validate:¹⁴ "The validity of contracts begins not but with the condition of a civil power sufficient to compel men to keep them." Otherwise "convents being but breath, bare no power to oblige." Hobbes has herein an imperfectly made distinction between the *forum externum* and the *forum internum*; for even with regard to the latter he requires reciprocity, so that a good man fallen among scoundrels is absolved from conscientious duties towards them. Under the compact men, as far as their legitimate interests allow, "should endeavor to accommodate others" (*De Corpore Publico*, ch. i., n. 7), and "abstain from revenge, reproach, derisions, hatred, contempt (n. 10, 11); they should try to keep the golden rule of doing as they would be done by (Chap. iv., n. 9). This second law of nature," truly a law, is very different from the former "law of nature," which was lawlessness, or the law of cupidity and brute force.

When Hobbes came to enunciate his theory of the social compact he showed what he was practically aiming at under the political condition of England at the time. He had suffered from the rebellion, and he wanted a restoration that should be permanent. At most the government for the future could on his theory—though he does not exactly apply it—come to an end by its own collapse. For with him right was might; therefore a King fallen into utter powerlessness would thereby cease to be King, but no people could of set purpose depose him for his iniquities; they could only plead that he had allowed them to sink back again into their primitive state of nature, from which they must again raise themselves by a

¹⁴ The penal sanction makes contract binding. *De Cive*, Chap. VI., n. 4. See *Leviathan*, Chap. XIV. "The force of nature being too weak to hold men to their contracts, there are in man but two imaginable helps, fear of consequences and pride in not appearing to need to break contracts, a generosity too rarely found." (Chap. XX.)

new compact. But upon such a question of possibility Hobbes does not find it convenient to animadvert. He is content with his principles that not even a majority can depose the once established sovereignty, whether of a single man or of a plurality; only God can punish the unjust ruler of a State, for absolutism is a necessary price to pay for deliverance from anarchy or the original state of nature. "A commonwealth is said to be instituted when a multitude¹⁵ of men covenant, every one with every one"—not "every one with the sovereign"—"that to whatsoever man or assembly of men shall be given the major part, the right to present the person of them all, every one as well he that voted for it, as he that voted against it, shall authorize all the actions and judgments of that man or assembly of men, in the same manner as if they were his own, to the end of living peaceably among themselves, and be protected against other men." (*Leviathan*, chap. xviii.) Afterwards "they cannot without his leave cast off the monarch;" for as long as he votes against his own deposition, no majority can deprive him; "there can happen no breach of covenant on the part of the sovereign," who "maketh no covenant with his subjects." The arguments on this point that the sovereign cannot be bound by limitations in the compact are specimens of the author's weakness and are quite trivial. They illustrate the grounds on which we previously said that his logic has been overrated. "Whatever the sovereign doth can be no injury to his subjects." He is judge of peace and war; also of religious doctrine so far as outward profession is concerned; he settles the rules for proprietorship; he decides as judge of all causes, and can be disobeyed only in the most antinatural extravagances; he chooses his ministers, magistrates and other officials. "These rights which make the name of sovereignty are incomunicable and inseparable." (*Chap. xviii. passim*. Cf. *De Cive*, chap xii.) Such is the absolutism of government by the great Leviathan, "that mortal God to whom we owe under the immortal God our peace and defense." Hobbes regarded the people as so anarchical that to keep them under some control even a tyranny might be allowed to endure. Better any despotism than a reversion to "the state of bare nature."¹⁶

One concession may be made to Hobbes, that in many stages of

¹⁵ The mere "multitude" is not a social body. To form a society it must first agree that the vote of the majority shall be decisive in establishing a political rule. (*De Cive*, Chap. VI., nn. 1 and 2.)

¹⁶ Hobbes three times states his theory: *Leviathan*, Chap. XIII. and XIV.; *De Cive*, Chap. I; *De Corpore Polit.*, Part I., Chaps. I. and II. His "fundamental laws of nature" are (1) "to seek peace and follow it, and by all means we can to defend ourselves;" (2) to renounce by mutual agreement the right of each to all, and to be content with equally shared liberties; (3) to keep covenants. (*Leviathan*, Chs. XIV. and XV.) Promises made where there is no civil power to enforce them are not covenants.

society physical force has been largely the determinant of what have been called rights; and this is a point which we to-day might easily let drop out of our calculation, with a disturbing result to our conclusions. "People are not aware how entirely in former ages the law of superior strength was the rule of life, how publicly and generally it was approved. I do not say cynically and shamelessly, for no such notion could then have found a place in the faculties of any person except of a philosopher or a saint. Resistance to the tyranny was regarded as a crime and the worst of all crimes, deserving the most cruel chastisement as such human being could inflict."¹⁷ Mill adds the remark that great as was the power of the Church to inspire renunciation of the world for the cloister, renunciation of wives who are canonically declared to be not legitimate wives, renunciation of home comforts for the hardships of a crusade, yet it could not stop the abuse of power in the hands of the rulers by whom it was held. In all these matters we may say that the Church sometimes succeeded, sometimes failed.

According to Warburton, the answers to the Leviathan would form a library. "The press sweats with controversy, and every young churchman militant would needs try his arms in thundering upon Hobbes' steel. The objection made by Shaftesbury, who detested Hobbes, against the clerical assailants of his selfishness was that for his universal principle of self-love they substituted fear of hell and hope of heaven, whereas the virtue which needs rewarding can be no virtue. Self-love in its prudential form, according to the Leviathan, drove men naturally to put themselves under a sovereign control. According to Shaftesbury, that end was brought about by a naturally good impulse in man towards harmonious balance between self-regarding interests and social welfare. The more beautiful prospect was the more persuasive."

Bentham, who reached some of the conclusions found in Hobbes,¹⁸ traveled by a different road to them, scorning all abstract speculation over liberty and right in order to insist simply on a utilitarian pragmatism. The individual living under a government which has some sort of practical absolutism should have just that amount of liberty which he could employ usefully for the public good, and the amount was far from being equal for all men. The cry for all-round equality he despised. Leslie Stephen says that Bentham simply omitted those ultimates that Hobbes boasted to have laid bare in the "De Cive," in which was given what the author claimed to be the first produced

¹⁷ Mill on the Subjection of Women, Chap. I.

¹⁸ See the "Fragment on Government," Ch. I.: "The only true and natural foundations of society are the wants and the fears of individuals, though we cannot believe that there was a time when there was no such thing as society."

theory of the State genuinely deduced from principles. Besides the origin of sovereignty from compact, Hobbes admitted another origin by conquest, but into this it does not concern us now to enter. We are content to point out in his contractual theory how, beginning with a wholly inadequate conception of human nature, he vainly seeks to rescue it from the wretched anarchy in which his principles would involve it by a surrender to an absolutism which is almost without limit. He almost wholly ignores the better conception of Aristotle, that nature is describable by its end, not by its most "beggarly elements;" that as it is etymologically a principle of growth or development, rising upwards to its entelechy or consummation in the most reasonable, ethereal, spiritual life, wherein the highest powers are blissfully exercised on their highest objects.

J. RICKABY, S. J.

Stonyhurst, England.

Book Reviews

THE PRINCIPLES OF PRAGMATISM. A Philosophical Interpretation of Experience. By H. Heath Bawden. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin Company. The Riverside Press, Cambridge, 1910.

This book calls our attention at once to a new volume of the Stonyhurst Philosophical Series which recently appeared, entitled "Theories of Knowledge: Absolutism, Pragmatism and Realism," by Leslie J. Walker, S. J., M. A. Published by Longmans, Green & Co. Of that book Rev. Michael Maher, S. J., says in the preface:

"It is therefore with great pleasure that I welcome the present volume, as, in my view, both a valuable addition to modern Catholic philosophical literature and also peculiarly suitable to present needs. It deals with the problem which lies at the root of so many other philosophical questions—the great problem of epistemology. The author in the course of his work undertakes primarily the examination of the two most keenly discussed theories of knowledge of the present day, absolutism and pragmatism. But in his study he is naturally led back to their sources in criticism and empiricism. He puts each system before us as expounded by its best representatives; he keeps constantly in view their mutual relations and their connections with Kant and Hume, and he contrasts the most important features of each theory with the realism of Aristotle and Aquinas. It is this method of intelligent and judicious consideration of current philosophical opinion from the standpoint of scholasticism that appears to me to be specially profitable to-day."

We have made this quotation in full because it expresses so well the necessity for Catholics of studying these subjects under Catholic direction and also the necessity for all earnest students to get the Catholic point of view. We shall now quote at length from the declaration of the author of the book before us in order to show the difference in treatment as well as in the point of view, and then we shall let our readers choose which book they will, or perhaps both. Mr. Bawden says:

"Pragmatism is a recent movement of thought which is seeking to do justice to the neglected claims of common sense, of religious faith, and of science, in determining a true philosophy of life. It is not the aim to construct a system, but to show how in pragmatism we may establish the basal conceptions of a new philosophy of experience. The significant fact in recent philosophy is the conscious demand for reconstruction of its method—a reconstruction of its whole purpose and procedure, not merely a patching-up of the existing machinery of reflective thought.

"This demand implies the breaking down of the customary division

of philosophy into theory of knowledge and theory of reality, and the treatment of these as phases of a general theory of experience. The course of discussion in the past few years between the leading schools of thought has made evident the need of a new statement of the issues involved. No one of the proposed systems has been generally accepted. The truth must lie somewhere in their uncriticized postulates. The present work is an attempt to set forth the necessary assumptions of a philosophy in which experience becomes self-conscious as method.

"This demand for reconstruction implies also a synthesizing of the fundamental underlying ideas in a form which the man of average intelligence and education may understand. In these days, when the different branches of philosophy have become professions, and their language as unintelligible to the layman as the technicalities of the special sciences, the need of simplification is obvious. Pragmatism is an attempt to meet this need. There have arisen, however, many apparently contradictory interpretations of this movement, even in the minds of its professed exponents. It is the hope of the author that these pages will aid in clarifying the meaning of this word 'pragmatism.' "

THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA. An International Work of Reference on the Constitution, Doctrine, Discipline and History of the Catholic Church. In fifteen volumes, with maps and illustrations. Volume V.III.: Infam—Lapp. Royal 8vo., pp. 800. New York: Robert Appleton Company.

As the subscriber to the Catholic Encyclopedia places each new volume on his book-shelf, he must derive special satisfaction from the thought that his confidence in the editors of the work was not misplaced. Now that the book is more than half completed, and is fully up to the highest standard of books of the kind in any language, the original subscriber has reason to congratulate himself on his good judgment which prompted him to lend his assistance in the beginning and to get possession of the precious volumes at the earliest possible moment. There is much pleasure also for such a one to see his storehouse grow and to realize that soon it will be complete and that he can draw from it an answer to practically every question concerning things Catholic.

The matter is being distributed very evenly, for the present volume brings it down to about the middle of the alphabet. As the work progresses one begins to understand better that it will furnish complete courses of study in various fields. For instance, it will contain a complete history of the Popes, a complete collection of lives of the saints, a full history of the Church by dioceses and countries, as well as by biographies, and in each of these fields a corps of writers is

employed, each chosen because of his special fitness for a certain phase of the subject. An illustration of the thoroughness with which each subject is treated is found under the heading "John," which calls for eighty-eight articles, not to mention many references.

Three very full and interesting papers are presented on Ireland, Italy and Japan. The first is divided into "Ireland" proper, in seventeen pages, by the latest Irish historian, E. A. D'Alton; "Irish Literature," in fifteen pages, by the distinguished and zealous Celtic scholar, Dr. Douglass Hyde, and the "Irish in Other Countries," in twelve pages, by Peter Condon. "Italy" is divided into "Italy" proper, in thirty-seven pages, by Commandatore Luigi Tacchi Venturi, and "Italian Literature," in seven pages, by Edmund G. Gardner, of Cambridge. The former is one of the most satisfactory papers of the kind we have seen. It is especially strong in its description of the formation of United Italy and the "Law of Guarantees." The illustrations are also noteworthy, being more numerous than usual and very artistic. The contribution on Japan, in twenty-five pages, by Justin Balette, Missionary Apostolic at Tokio, gives a splendid account of the Japanese missions, besides bringing out clearly the general history and geography of the country.

Among the specially timely subjects we find "Joan of Arc," by Father Thurston, S. J. In this case also the illustrations are noteworthy. A good example of the special fitness of the writer to the subject may be seen in Father Maas, S. J., and "Jesus." Probably no one could be found better fitted for the subject than this learned Jesuit and Scriptural scholar.

But where there is so much of excellence and interest it is difficult to dwell upon special contributions without unduly extending this notice and without the appearance of unfairness to other contributors. If we have dwelt for a moment on some few of the papers, it is only to call attention to the work as a whole and to urge again all who have not subscribed for it to do so at the earliest possible moment, so as to make accessible as soon as possible the fund of information already created in these volumes.

HISTOIRE GENERALE DE L'EGLISE par *Fernand Mourret*, Professeur au
Séminaire de Saint Sulpice; La Renaissance et la Réforme. Pp. 604.

In these days of specialization "General Histories" are no longer in favor. To compass in any way adequately the history of the Church, not to say of mankind or any considerable section thereof, is usually regarded as practically impossible. General histories are now produced by the coöperative method, sections of the whole being assigned to individual specialists. The well-known Cambridge

Modern History, for instance, is being produced on this plan. Though all this is true, nevertheless there is room for and there is possibility of a satisfactory general history of the Church being produced by a single hand. Of this fact the work here introduced is evidence—*abesse ad posse valet illatio*. The general undertaking, whereof the volume at hand forms one segment, contemplates a general history of the Church that shall take an intermediate place between the voluminous histories by Rohrbacher, Darras, etc., and the class-book compendia. The programme includes eight large octavos, of which the third, “*l'Eglise et le Monde Barbare*” (from the fifth to the tenth century) and the volume in title above (fourteenth to the sixteenth century) have thus far been published. The sixth volume is in press and the remainder in preparation.

The volume at hand is divided into three parts. The first part, devoted to the Renaissance, describes the decline of the mediæval institutions, the work of “the Legists,” the religious, social and intellectual crisis that sprang from the sojourn of the Papacy at Avignon, was hastened and heightened by the great Western schism and the humanistic movement. Colossal figures loom up along the march of events—Boniface VIII., Alexander VI., Leo X., Wiclef, Hus, Savanarola, Petrarch, Dante, Michal Angelo, Raphael, da Vinci and the rest—leaders some of them, products others, of their secular and religious environment.

The second part embraces the Protestant Reformation, Luther, Calvin, Henry VIII. and the other dominant Reformers being here the central figures.

The third part, dealing with the Catholic Reformation, describes the efforts of the Papacy and the Council of Trent to institute a reformation “in the head and members” of the sixteenth century Church, and the splendid religious renewal effected by the columnar saints—Pius V., Charles Borromeo, Ignatius and Teresa.

The volume, it will thus be seen, describes one of the great crises in the life of the Church. It calls no less for great discernment in distinguishing the causes and the results of the tremendous agitation in the whole civilized organism than for judicious balance in estimating the relative responsibility of the leading moral agencies at work. Evidences of both these qualities are abundant in these pages. The broad collation of historical sources testifies to the author's care in laying the basis of critical discernment, while the spirit of candor and impartiality evince throughout the exercise of the judicial temper. The erudition patent in every chapter substantiates his claim upon the serious attention of the professional student of history. The graceful and vivid style which clothes the narrative makes the book one which the average educated reader will profit by and enjoy.

We might here add that the individual volumes of the general course may be purchased separately ($7\frac{1}{2}$ francs).

JULIENNE DE NORWICH: REVELATIONS DE L'AMOUR DE DIEU. Traduite par un Benedictin de Farnborough (Dom Gabriel Meunier). Paris: Oudin, 1910. Pp. xxxv.+399.

It is seldom that we have any occasion to introduce through the REVIEW a book translated from the English into a foreign language. Usually the experience is the reverse. Moreover, as regards the volume before us, to do so may seem indeed *actum agere*—carrying coals to Newcastle; for readers who are liking to be interested in the *Revelations* of Mother Juliana will probably prefer making their acquaintance through the original rather than through any translated medium. There is a freshness, a simplicity, a charm in the quaint English of the fourteenth century which no foreign language—even translucent French—can hope to convey. On the other hand, it may well be that some of our readers—many, let us hope—being drawn to the marvels of divine love of which the saintly Anchoress of Norwich was a favored subject, desire to have access to the fullest sources of information on the matter. To them we would strongly recommend the present translation—not so much because of the merits of the version itself, which are considerable, the rendering being at once faithful and smooth—but because of the editorial apparatus. The critical introduction is valuable for its bibliographical information and collations, while the appendix supplies a number of interesting notes which throw additional light on the settings and bearings of the Revelations. There is also a map representing the city of Norwich as it was in the time of Mother Juliana.

It is hardly necessary to add that these Revelations form no part of the deposite of faith. They are private and individual; not public and communal. At the same time they are so closely in harmony with the truths of faith that the devout Catholic will find no difficulty in according to them a human faith and using them to nurture piety and devotion—seeing especially that they centre on the Passion of our Divine Lord. What draws one spontaneously to the revelations of Mother Juliana is their immediate verisimilitude. They appeal to one as objective, as communications to the recipient, not as projections of her mind. Her own additions or interpretations stand out distinct from the illuminations which she received. This gives the devout reader the confidence that she was indeed a vehicle through which God manifested the excesses of His love. "Will it well: Love was His meaning. Who showed it thee? Love.

Wherefore showed He it thee? For love." All these "showings" centre here.

SAINT IGNATIUS. By *Francis Thompson*. Edited by John Hungerford Pollen, S. J. With ninety superb illustrations by H. W. Brewer and others. 8vo., cloth, net, \$3.25. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago.

"Francis Thompson accepted the commission for this 'Life of St. Ignatius' some years before his death—accepted it with an alacrity not always attending the set task. Since it has been often said of him that he was a seventeenth century poet born into the nineteenth, he had almost a contemporary's affinity with the age in which the Society of Jesus set forth. He brought to his biography the sympathy of genius with genius. Original research was beside his plan; he purposed to tell—if he could, to tell better—a story thrice told by others. A familiar figure in the library of the British Museum he accordingly became, and Oxford street was meditatively paced by him many a night with some Ignatian volume—the 'Life' by Stewart Rose for choice—tucked tight beneath his arm.

"When Francis Thompson died, in November, 1907, he had meanwhile become famous, and it was a question whether the master mind of many a creation in poetry could be fairly gauged by a biography in prose. A perusal of the manuscript, which, after many pauses, he had finally completed, put all doubt at rest. An appointed labor it might have been; it had proved a labor of love. Its pages betray none of the dullness of a duty painfully performed. This story of a great revival, of fruitful conversions, carries an invitation to our own languishing day. Many shall surely discover in it their own Manresa—a cradle of all sorts of vocations, a nursery of neophytes. When John Henry Newman was asked what he thought of Wellington's 'Dispatches,' he said they made him 'burn to be a soldier'; and many a soldier reading this book may yet burn to be a saint.

"At any rate, what the writing of the 'Life' did for its author, the close study of it may do for his reader. It helped him to become a lover of the saint, and of that sanctity which he commonly spoke of as 'genius in religion.' It brought him near to Ignatius and his companions, the buffeted and the crossed; and, let it be added, if the relation is not too personal, it moved him to ask spiritual alms from the London sons of the saint during the last stages of his arid journey through life.

"The publishers have greatly added to the adornment of the volume by placing at its disposal the drawings which that master draughtsman, the late H. W. Brewer, assisted by his son, Mr. H. C. Brewer, originally made to illustrate the text of 'Stewart Rose's'

large biography. These artists sought in the main to reproduce the scenes of the saint's life as they appeared to his own eyes; a restoration in which they had the assistance of the Bollandists and of other experts. Finally the proofs have had the advantage of careful revision from a high Ignatian authority—none higher—Father John Hungerford Pollen, S. J. Mr. Percival Lucas has been the index-maker."

This account of the making of Francis Thompson's Life of St. Ignatius is so happy and so true that a better notice of the book could not be written. It is really a charming work and easily holds first place in its field this year. We shall never have anything quite like it again, because Francis Thompson is dead.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF RELIGION. A Study in Anthropology and Social Psychology. By Irving King, Ph. D., State University of Iowa. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1910. All rights reserved.

The author sets forth his purpose and plan so plainly that we feel we can please him and our readers best by making room for his declaration:

"As the sub-title indicates, this volume is a study in the social psychology of primitive religion. It is, however, far from complete as first planned. It was the original intention to include a number of topics which are of great interest to the student of primitive religion, such as the development of sacrifice and the origin and development of birth, marriage, death and burial ceremonies. Not only have some topics been omitted; those which are here offered to the public are far from completely worked out. They have been written at irregular intervals during the past eight years, in the midst of many duties which tended inevitably to destroy the continuity of thought as well as to render a thorough working out of individual problems well-nigh impossible. Under these circumstances it is but natural that, as the work has proceeded, there should have been a change in interest and, to some extent, in point of view.

"In treating the various phases of the problem the author has attempted to offer sufficient illustrations to lend weight to the positions he has taken. It has not seemed best to try to make these illustrations exhaustive. In almost every instance those offered are only a tithe of the ones which might have been given.

"Nothing set forth in these pages is presented in a dogmatic spirit. In every detail, whether of fact or of interpretation, the author holds himself subject to correction and criticism. While it is scarcely possible but that some errors have been incurred, it is hoped that the general point of view may appeal to students of anthropology, sociology and psychology as suggestive and pertinent.

"As regards the view-point it is, in a word, that the religious attitude has been built up through the overt activities which appear in primitive social groups, activities which were either spontaneous and playful or which appeared with reference to meeting various practical needs of the life-process; and that the development of emotional values has been mediated through the fact that these activities were in the main social."

The readers of the QUARTERLY will understand, of course, that this is not a Catholic book. Our theory of the development of religion is quite different from that of the author, but his is interesting and worthy of respect and consideration.

HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY, 1789-1908. By Rev. James MacCaffrey, Professor of Ecclesiastical History in St. Patrick's College, Maynooth. Two volumes, 8vo., pp. 510 and 590. St. Louis: B. Herder & Co.

Another splendid example of that best of all forms of history, the story of an epoch written while the actors and witnesses, or those who were in actual touch with them, are still living; penned before the documents and monuments on which true history must be based have crumbled away or have been destroyed.

It is sometimes said that the history of recent events should not be written because it must lack historical perspective. But it is surely a mistake. Let us have the history now—the recording of events and the perspective—the philosophy of history afterwards. Is it not better to view a beautiful landscape near at hand without perfect perspective, but with all the parts in correct relation to one another, than to wait until we can ascend a hill from which we hope to enjoy a better perspective, only to find that we are so far away from the scene and objects have become so blurred that we cannot get a correct conception of the picture? Those who are writing contemporary history—and the number is increasing each year—think so, and we agree with them.

The period covered by these two volumes is a very important one, beginning as it does with a chapter on the French Revolution and ending with 1908. This century has meant much for the Church, with the vast emigration of Catholic peoples from the old countries to North and South America, Canada and Australia, and with the pregnant changes which have taken place and are taking place in the Catholic countries of Europe, where infidelity, anarchy and socialism with all their agencies are striving to crush out not only Catholicity, but Christianity. Such a period offers a rich field to the historian, and Dr. MacCaffrey has done well to take advantage of it. He deals with the period in successive chapters according to coun-

tries. This method necessarily causes some repetition, but that is inevitable, more or less, under any system. In the first volume we have France, the German States, Belgium, Holland, Spain, Portugal, Northern Europe and Italy. England and Ireland occupy large space, and America and Australia loom up important.

We do not attempt to give a full review of the book, our purpose being to draw attention to the importance of a work of this kind and to assure our readers that Dr. MacCaffrey has done that work admirably.

L'ÉGLISE GEORGIENNE DES ORIGENES JUSQU'A NOS JOURS par *Michael Tamarati*. Rome: M. Bretschneider, 1910. Pp. xv.

The history of the Church in Georgia (European) is written in tears and blood—an unending crusade it has been, a continuous martyrology, as M. Tamarati calls it. For centuries she has struggled with heresy to preserve the heritage of faith, while she has borne the reiterated onslaughts of the fiercest enemies both of civilization and of Christianity. Few histories are so inspiring, because few are made up of so many and such prolonged deeds of heroism. And yet, strange to say, the history of Georgia, political no less than religious, is comparatively unknown. Why this should be the case it is not easy to say. Certainly it cannot be through dearth of sources of material. The various Roman archives and the great European libraries afford a great wealth of manuscript documents, to say nothing of the large number of easily obtainable printed works more or less directly tributary to the subject. Probably the reason lies in the fact that thus far the historian has been wanting—the scholar equipped with patience and critical ability to sift the immense material and endowed with imagination and feeling to tell the story true to the real life of the people as well as to the chronicles of their political and religious doings. If we may take the splendid work before us as evidence, such a historian has at length arisen. The immense bibliography with which he introduces the volume and the indications on every page of the minute research upon which he has based his narrative, inspires the reader with confidence, while the graphic style sustains the reader's interest throughout.

The work, as the title indicates, is principally a history of the Church in Georgia; but since the religious life of the people is intermingled with their political and civil development, their secular history receives a due share of the narrative. This in turn has necessitated the introduction of geographical and ethnographical information, which so far from detracting from the unity of the work completes and humanizes it. Besides this, a considerable

wealth of illustrations, portraits and maps, together with the truly splendid make-up of the quarto volume and the detailed indexes, etc., contributes very much both to the value and the attractiveness of the work. The book is one of which the author and the publisher and the Catholic reader may equally be proud.

A HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES FOR SCHOOLS. By *S. E. Forman*, author of "Advanced Physics," etc. 12mo., pp. 500, with illustrations and maps. The Century Company, New York.

Though necessarily brief, this book is complete and comprehensive. It is very attractive in style and form. The maps and illustrations are new and up-to-date, and it is hard to see room for improvement. The distinctive features are: The method of unfolding the story of the country's growth step by step from small beginnings to its present great proportions; the special prominence given to the progress of the Western movement, which is told with greater fullness than in any previous school history, and which shows that the greatness of our history is due as much to the Western States as to those on the Atlantic seaboard; the treatment of the biographical element, which makes the great leaders of our country stand out as real and interesting personalities; the account given of the commercial, industrial and social development, which teaches how we have passed from the simple life of the seventeenth century to the complex life of to-day; the material provided for the teachers' assistance consisting of questions on the text at the end of each chapter, with review of questions, topics for special reading and special references, and comprehensive outlines and analytical reviews in the appendix; the fullness and richness of its maps and illustrations, the former being entirely new and the latter having been selected from authentic sources, illustrating in many cases Western life in the early days; the clearness and interest of its style, which is simple, something almost colloquial, but never undignified. Altogether a very attractive book.

MISSALE ROMANUM. Ex Decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini Restitutum S. Pii V., Pontificis Maximi Iussu Editium. Clementis VIII., Urbani VIII. et Leonis XIII. Auctoritate Recognitum. Editio Decima septima Post Alteram Typicam. Neo Eboraci: Sumptibus et Typis Frederici Pustet. MDCCCCX.

This new large folio edition of the Missal is a thing of joy, with its large clear-cut type on heavy tinted paper and its broad leaves with ample margin. It is most inviting as it lies open on the altar, and it strikes the eye at once as a becoming piece of altar furnishing and worthy of its high office as a necessary adjunct of the proper celebration of the Holy Sacrifice. As we turn over its leaves we see

that it has many noteworthy features, in addition to being complete and strictly up-to-date. At the beginning of the seasons and the principal feasts there is a picture in black and white suitable to the occasion surrounded by smaller pictures illustrating texts from the prophets bearing on the main event. There are several full-page pictures in colors with beautiful illuminated borders and decorations and accompanied by smaller pictures showing the figures of the realities of the New Testament. The initial letters throughout are large red caps in ornamental background, but the initials of the prayers of the canon are highly illuminated in gold and colors.

Altogether the book is an aid to devotion, because it brings to the hand and the eye of the priest all that he must find in the Missal in the most convenient and most attractive form and with least distraction.

DENYS D'ALEXANDRIE. SA VIE, SON TEMPS, SES OEUVRES, par J. Burel.
One vol. in 16. Bloud et Cie, 7 place Saint-Sulpice, Paris.

Tillemont, in beginning his article on Denis of Alexandria,

says that he was the greatest ornament of that second church of the world from the days of St. Mark to those of St. Athanasius. This eulogy is in nowise exaggerated. In fact, Denis of Alexandria was concerned in all the important events occupying the attention of the Church from 247 to 264; the persecution of Denis and Valerian, the reconciliation of the lapsi; the controversies on baptism, on the Trinity. Everywhere he fulfilled the role of a peacemaker. His character seems to bear the two-fold stamp of power and sweetness, admirably combined, so as to win the sympathy of men of every age and clime. Students will undoubtedly welcome this new work of M. Burel.

LA MISSION LE SAINT BENOIT. Par le Cardinal Newman. Bloud et Cie,
7 place Saint-Sulpice, Paris.

In the opinion of Newman, the life of the saints is a convincing proof of the divinity of the Christian religion. For this reason the magnificent essay of the master of Oxford entitled "The Mission of St. Benedict" was made part of the collection of publications given to the world under the name "Science et Religion." This writing is not a biography properly so-called, nevertheless, of all that has been published on the work of the monks in the Middle Ages, nothing comes near this essay as regards depth and literary excellence. We find in it all the charm of style, the richness of thought and the superabundance of illustration so characteristic of the writings of Newman.

70567

PERIODICAL



DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

